

Coniveau filtrations and finite dimensionality for pure motives

Charles Vial

Abstract

Let X be a smooth projective variety over a field $k \subset \mathbf{C}$. We define a coniveau filtration $\tilde{N}$ – *a priori* different from the usual coniveau filtration N – on the singular cohomology of X with rational coefficients. If X satisfies the Lefschetz conjecture B, we prove that the projectors $H_*(X) \rightarrow \tilde{N}^j H_i(X) \rightarrow H_*(X)$ are induced by algebraic correspondences. If moreover X is finite dimensional in the sense of Kimura (for example, X could be any abelian variety or any finite quotient thereof) the Chow motive of X admits a refined Chow-Künneth decomposition lifting the coniveau grading on the cohomology of X and we study the behavior of the Chow groups of X under this decomposition. As an application, we give several conjectural descriptions of the rational Chow groups of X depending on the support of the cohomology groups of X . We also consider the case where k is an arbitrary field. Results valid in characteristic zero extend to positive characteristic if one is ready to admit that the Lefschetz conjecture holds in general.

Introduction

Given a smooth projective variety X of dimension d over a field k , its cohomology ring is endowed with a coniveau filtration. Precisely, if H^* denotes a fixed Weil cohomology theory over the field k (e.g. ℓ -adic cohomology $H^*(X \times_k \bar{k}, \mathbf{Q}_\ell)$ with $\ell \neq \text{char } k$ or Betti cohomology $H^*(X(\mathbf{C}), \mathbf{Q})$ if $k \subset \mathbf{C}$), we define $N^j H^i(X)$ to be the subgroup of $H^i(X)$ whose elements are supported in codimension j , that is those elements that come from $H_Z^i(X)$ for some closed subset Z of X of codimension j via the natural map $H_Z^i(X) \rightarrow H^i(X)$.

There are strong links between the Chow group of a complex smooth projective variety X and the coniveau of its singular cohomology ring. Mumford [28] is the first to show that for a surface S , representability of the Chow group of 0-cycles of degree 0 implies that there are no global non-trivial holomorphic 2-forms on S , or equivalently that $H^2(X)$ is supported in codimension 1. Equivalently, if $H^2(S)$ is not supported in codimension one then the Chow group of 0-cycles is “huge” in the sense that it is bigger than an abelian variety. This was later generalized by Roitman [33] who proved that if $CH_0(X)_{\text{hom}}$ is representable then the Hodge numbers $h^{n,0}$ vanish for $n \geq 2$. Bloch [7] made this more precise by conjecturing that conversely if a surface admits no global non-trivial holomorphic

2-form then its Chow group of 0-cycles should be representable. This is known as the Bloch conjecture and its generalization to varieties and cycles of higher dimension led to what is known now as the Bloch-Beilinson-Murre conjectures. These conjectures predict the existence of a canonical filtration on the Chow groups of smooth projective varieties and is related to the existence of a conjectural category of mixed motives, see [15] for a very nice survey.

Bloch and Srinivas [6] introduced the technique of “decomposition of the diagonal” which relies on the idea of looking at generic 0-cycles to give another proof of the Mumford-Roitman theorem (see also Laterveer [23] and Paranjape [32] for other applications of this technique). Their proof actually shows that if $CH_0(X)_{\text{hom}}$ is representable then $H^k(X)$ is supported in codimension 1 for $k \geq 2$. The vanishing of the Hodge numbers $h^{n,0}$ for $n \geq 2$ then comes as a consequence. This already suggests that the coniveau filtration on cohomology is more important than the Hodge filtration F on cohomology, at least concerning the matter of understanding Chow groups. Note that however, there is another filtration – the Hodge coniveau filtration N_H – which should agree with the coniveau filtration N by Grothendieck’s generalized Hodge conjecture. The technique of decomposition of the diagonal was also used by Jannsen [15] and Esnault-Levine [9] to prove that injectivity of the rational cycle class map in all dimensions to singular cohomology (resp. to Deligne cohomology) implies its surjectivity and more precisely that $H^{2i}(X) = N^i H^{2i}(X)$ (resp. $H^{2i-1}(X) = N^{i-1} H^{2i-1}(X)$) for all i .

From now on, we switch to a covariant setting and we will write

$$H_i(X) := H^i(X)^\vee = H^{2d-i}(X)$$

where the second equality is the identification given by Poincaré duality (and forgetting the Tate twist).

The category of numerical motives over k with rational coefficients is a semi-simple abelian category. Returning to the coniveau filtration, it is then possible to define a coniveau filtration, still denoted N , on numerical motives. It has the important property of being canonically split.

The hard Lefschetz theorem states that any ample divisor L on X induces an isomorphism $L^i : H_{d+i}(X) \xrightarrow{\simeq} H_{d-i}(X)$. We say that X satisfies the Lefschetz conjecture and we write $B(X)$ if for all i the inverse of L^i is algebraic, i.e. if it is induced by an algebraic correspondence. It can be shown that $B(X)$ does not depend on the choice of a polarization L on X , see [21, corollary 2.10].

Kleiman [22, Theorem 4-1] proved that $B(X)$ implies that the weight decomposition $H_*(X) = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{2d} H_i(X)$ is of motivic nature (we say the Künneth conjecture holds for X). This weight decomposition gives a decomposition of the homological motive of X , $\mathfrak{h}^{\text{hom}}(X) = \bigoplus_i \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{hom}}(X)$ and *a fortiori* a decomposition of the numerical motive of X , $\mathfrak{h}^{\text{num}}(X) = \bigoplus_i \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)$. This decomposition further decomposes as $\mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X) = \bigoplus_j (X, \pi_{i,j}^{\text{num}}, 0)$ where $(X, \pi_{i,j}^{\text{num}}, 0) := \text{Gr}_N^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)$. This is called the refined Künneth

decomposition for $\mathfrak{h}_{\text{num}}(X)$ (cf. §2). In the case numerical and homological equivalence agree, we will show that $H_*(N^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)) = N^j H_i(X)$.

Actually, we will introduce a finer coniveau filtration denoted $\tilde{N}$ which will appear more natural for our purposes. Just like the filtration N , this decreasing filtration $\tilde{N}$ is defined both on the homology $H_i(X)$ (see §1.3) and on the weight i part $\mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)$ of the numerical motive of X (assuming $C(X)$, see §2.2) in a compatible way, meaning that if homological and numerical equivalence agree then $H_*(\tilde{N}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)) = \tilde{N}^j H_i(X)$ (see proposition 2.9). Moreover, the filtrations $\tilde{N} \subseteq N$ agree if the Lefschetz conjecture holds for all smooth projective varieties. Assuming the Künneth conjecture for X , we set the projector $\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}^{\text{num}}$ (a correspondence on X modulo numerical equivalence) to be such that $\text{Gr}_{\tilde{N}}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)$ is isomorphic to $(X, \tilde{\pi}_{i,j}^{\text{num}}, 0)$.

Suppose now that the base field k is a subfield of $\mathbf{C}$ and that H_* is Betti homology. Then, assuming the Lefschetz conjecture for X only, we will even show that the projection maps $H^*(X) \twoheadrightarrow \tilde{N}^j H_i(X) \hookrightarrow H^*(X)$ are induced by algebraic correspondences and that $H_*(\tilde{N}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)) = \tilde{N}^j H_i(X)$ (see §4.2). A feature of the characteristic zero case which is crucial is that, under $B(X)$, the bilinear form $Q := \langle -, L_*^{i-d} - \rangle$ on $H_i(X)$ induced by the choice of a polarization on X restricts to a non degenerate form on $\tilde{N}^j H_i(X)$ and thus that the coniveau filtration $\tilde{N}$ on $H_i(X)$ splits canonically with respect to the form Q , see proposition 3.4.

We are ready to state (see theorems 4.6, 4.7 and 4.8, and see theorem 4.3 for a positive characteristic version)

Theorem 1. *Suppose k has characteristic zero. Assume the Lefschetz conjecture holds for X (and hence homological and numerical equivalence agree on $X \times X$). Then the numerical motive $\mathfrak{h}^{\text{num}}(X)$ admits a refined Künneth decomposition $\mathfrak{h}^{\text{num}}(X) = \bigoplus \text{Gr}_{\tilde{N}}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X) = \bigoplus (X, \tilde{\pi}_{i,j}^{\text{num}}, 0)$ such that $\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}^{\text{num}}$ is the projector $H_*(X, \mathbf{Q}) \twoheadrightarrow \text{Gr}_{\tilde{N}}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}) \hookrightarrow H_*(X, \mathbf{Q})$ on the graded pieces of the rational cohomology for the coniveau filtration. Moreover, for any such decomposition $\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}^{\text{num}}$ is numerically equivalent to a cycle supported on $Y^j \times Z_{i-j}$ with Y^j and Z_{i-j} closed subschemes of X such that $\dim Y^j = d - j$ and $\dim Z_{i-j} = i - j$.*

In order to relate the coniveau filtration on cohomology to filtrations on Chow groups, it is natural to lift the refined Künneth decomposition of the numerical motive of X to a decomposition of the Chow motive of X , i.e. the motive of X for rational equivalence. A sufficient property X has to satisfy (in addition to the Künneth conjecture) in order to do this is that the Chow motive $\mathfrak{h}(X)$ should be finite dimensional in the sense of Kimura. Indeed, under such an assumption, any orthogonal sum of idempotents modulo numerical equivalence lifts to an orthogonal sum of idempotents modulo rational equivalence. So, if $\mathfrak{h}(X)$ is finite dimensional, then it admits a Chow-Künneth decomposition $\mathfrak{h}(X) = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{2d} \mathfrak{h}_i(X)$ lifting the Künneth decomposition of $\mathfrak{h}^{\text{num}}(X)$. Moreover, each $\mathfrak{h}_i(X)$ decomposes as $\bigoplus_j (X, \tilde{\pi}_{i,j}, 0)$ with $\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}$ a projector modulo rational equivalence lifting $\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}^{\text{num}}$.

Theorem 2. *Let X be a smooth projective variety of dimension d over a field k of characteristic zero whose Chow motive $\mathfrak{h}(X)$ is finite dimensional. Assume the Lefschetz conjecture holds for X . Then the motive $\mathfrak{h}(X)$ admits a refined Chow-Künneth decomposition $\mathfrak{h}(X) = \bigoplus (X, \tilde{\pi}_{i,j}, 0)$ lifting the refined Künneth decomposition $\mathfrak{h}^{\text{num}}(X) = \bigoplus \text{Gr}_{\tilde{N}}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)$ such that for any such decomposition*

1. $\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}$ acts as 0 on $CH_l(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ if either $l < j$ or $l > i - j$.
2. $\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}$ acts as 0 on $CH_l(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ if $l = i - j$ and $i < 2j$.
3. $\tilde{\pi}_{i,j} = 0$ if and only if $\text{Gr}_{\tilde{N}}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}) = 0$.
4. $CH_i(X)_{\text{num}, \mathbf{Q}} = \text{Ker}(\tilde{\pi}_{2i,i} : CH_i(X)_{\mathbf{Q}} \rightarrow CH_i(X)_{\mathbf{Q}})$.
5. If $k \subset \mathbf{C}$ and if $AJ_i : CH_i(X)_{\text{alg}, \mathbf{Q}} \rightarrow J_i^a(X) \otimes \mathbf{Q}$ is the Abel-Jacobi map to the algebraic part of Griffiths's i^{th} intermediate Jacobian tensored with $\mathbf{Q}$, then

$$\text{Ker}(AJ_i) = \text{Ker}(\tilde{\pi}_{2i+1,i} : CH_i(X)_{\text{alg}, \mathbf{Q}} \rightarrow CH_i(X)_{\text{alg}, \mathbf{Q}}).$$

It is known that any abelian variety is finite dimensional. Moreover, Lieberman proved in [25, 26] the Lefschetz conjecture for abelian varieties defined over a field of characteristic zero. Therefore, our theorem includes the case of all abelian varieties in characteristic 0. As a corollary, we get a result of Beauville [4] on the vanishing of the action of some Künneth projectors on the Chow groups of abelian varieties (cf. corollary 4.13). In [21, 2A11] Kleiman showed how Lieberman's arguments are algebraic in nature and proved the Lefschetz conjecture for abelian varieties in positive characteristic. Using this result and [19, 7.7.4], we are able to extend Beauville's result to the positive characteristic case (remark 4.15).

The first three points in the theorem are consequences of theorem 1 together with standard results for finite dimensional motives (lemmas 1.13 and 1.14 and proposition 4.9). The proof of the two last points is based on the construction of explicit mutually orthogonal projectors $\tilde{\Pi}_{2i,i}$ and $\tilde{\Pi}_{2i+1,i}$ as done in [39], see propositions 4.18 and 4.20.

As a consequence of our analysis of the refined Chow-Künneth decomposition for X , we get (see proposition 5.2)

Theorem 3. *Let X be a smooth projective complex variety satisfying the Lefschetz conjecture and whose Chow motive is finite dimensional. If i is an integer such that $H_k(X) = \tilde{N}^1 H_k(X)$ for all $k > i$, then $CH_0(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ is supported in dimension i .*

Guletskii and Pedrini [12, Th. 7] proved this result in the case X is a surface and Voisin [43, Th. 3] proved it in the case $i = 0$ assuming the Hodge conjecture for all varieties.

Organization of the paper. We start with a section aimed at fixing the notations and gathering well-known results about filtrations on cohomology (the coniveau filtrations N

and $\tilde{N}$ as well as the Hodge coniveau filtration on Hodge structures), algebraic cycles and motives. It contains some easy preliminary results used in the rest of the paper.

In section 2, we define the coniveau filtration N on numerical motives and the coniveau filtration $\tilde{N}$ on the weight i part $\mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)$ of the numerical motive of a smooth projective variety X satisfying the Künneth conjecture. We show some first properties and give some sufficient conditions for them to coincide. We also give some sufficient conditions for them to be compatible with the corresponding filtrations on homology (§2.3). We also explain how, admitting the Hodge conjecture, these filtrations give in characteristic zero a “motivic Hodge decomposition” of the numerical motive of X . Many results of this section can be found in [1, §8] and [19, §7].

In section 3, we are interested in some duality properties of these coniveau filtrations both on cohomology and on numerical motives. In particular, we prove under $B(X)$ that the Poincaré pairing $\tilde{N}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}) \otimes_{\mathbf{Q}} \tilde{N}^{d-i+j} H_{2d-i}(X, \mathbf{Q}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}$ is non degenerate. This reflects the greater flexibility that the filtration $\tilde{N}$ has over the filtration N .

We are then ready to move on to prove theorems 1 and 2 in section 4. Paragraph 4.5 contains remarks on how the remaining refined Chow-Künneth projectors (i.e. those that don’t act trivially on $CH_l(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$) should act on $CH_l(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$.

Even if we do not get all the vanishing conjectures as stated by Murre [30] (see conjecture 1.12), we are able to draw several conditional consequences of these theorems in section 5. We show how – conjecturally – the vanishing of some graded pieces of the cohomology for the coniveau filtration implies injectivity of some cycle class maps and support of Chow groups in certain dimensions. In particular, we prove that Kimura’s conjecture together with Grothendieck’s generalized Hodge conjecture imply the generalized Bloch conjecture (proposition 5.2).

Conventions. All the schemes considered are separated schemes of finite type over a given field k . A variety is an irreducible and reduced scheme.

If X is a smooth projective variety over k we will write

- $C(X)$ if X satisfies the Künneth conjecture.
- $B(X)$ if X satisfies the Lefschetz conjecture.
- $D(X)$ if numerical and homological equivalence agree for cycles on X .

We have the well-known implications

$$D(X \times X) \Rightarrow B(X) \Rightarrow C(X).$$

The implication $D(X \times X) \Rightarrow B(X)$ was proved by Smirnov [38] and is actually an equivalence in characteristic zero since then $B(X) \Rightarrow D(X)$ ([1, 5.4.2.2]) and $B(X) \Rightarrow B(X \times X)$. The implication $B(X) \Rightarrow C(X)$ is due to Kleiman [22].

As already explained in the introduction, we will be constructing projectors in two different ways. One using the semi-simplicity of numerical motives and then lifting those projectors to projectors modulo a finer equivalence relation when permitted. Another one by constructing directly those projectors (§§4.2, 5 and 6). This shows through in our notations.

Under the Künneth conjecture being true for X a smooth projective variety over any field k ,

- $\pi_{i,j}^{\text{num}}$ will denote a projector modulo numerical equivalence for the filtration N and precisely $(X, \pi_{i,j}^{\text{num}}, 0) = \text{Gr}_N^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)$ (the filtration splits canonically).
- $\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}^{\text{num}}$ will denote a projector modulo numerical equivalence for the filtration $\tilde{N}$ and precisely $(X, \tilde{\pi}_{i,j}^{\text{num}}, 0) \simeq \text{Gr}_{\tilde{N}}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)$.
- The projectors $\pi_{i,j}^{\text{num}}$ (resp. $\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}^{\text{num}}$) lift uniquely up to isomorphism to mutually orthogonal projectors $\pi_{i,j}^{\text{hom}}$ (resp. $\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}^{\text{hom}}$) modulo homological equivalence (either Betti cohomology or ℓ -adic cohomology).
- In the case the Chow motive of X is finite dimensional, these projectors lift uniquely up to isomorphism to mutually orthogonal projectors modulo rational equivalence which we will write $\pi_{i,j}$ and $\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}$ respectively.

If X is only assumed to be a smooth projective variety over a field $k \subset \mathbf{C}$, then

- A correspondence in $\mathcal{Z}_{\dim X}^{\text{hom}}(X \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ denoted $\tilde{\Pi}_{i,j}^{\text{hom}}$ is a projector which induces the projection $H_*(X) \rightarrow \text{Gr}_{\tilde{N}}^j H_i(X) \rightarrow H_*(X)$ in homology.

1 Definitions and notations

1.1 Chow groups and pure motives

We assume the reader is familiar with the notion of pure motive as defined in [1] and [37]. We adopt a covariant setting for which we refer to [19].

Let k be a field and $\mathcal{V}_k$ be the category of smooth projective schemes over k . Let X be a d -dimensional smooth projective variety over k .

Weil cohomology theories. A Weil cohomology theory is a contravariant functor H^* from the category of smooth projective varieties over k to the category of finite dimensional vector spaces over some field of characteristic zero satisfying certain properties. In particular it comes with a cycle class map and satisfies a Künneth formula and Poincaré duality. For a general definition, see [1, §3.3]. Concretely we will be considering two such

theories, each of which satisfies the weak and the hard Lefschetz theorem. In this paper, we adopt a covariant point of view and will therefore consider the dual versions of such theories.

If k is a field of characteristic zero given with a fixed embedding $k \subset \mathbf{C}$, $H_i(X)$ will denote the dual of the Betti cohomology group $H^i(X(\mathbf{C}), \mathbf{Q})$. Such groups have additional structures, namely they come with a polarization.

If k has characteristic $p > 0$, we fix a prime number $\ell \neq p$ and $H_i(X)$ will denote the dual of the ℓ -adic cohomology group $H^i(X \times_k \bar{k}, \mathbf{Q}_\ell)$ where $\bar{k}$ is a separable closure of k . They come with an action of the Galois group of k which turns them into $\text{Gal}(k)$ -modules.

Ignoring the Tate twists, these groups identify respectively to $H^{2d-i}(X(\mathbf{C}), \mathbf{Q})$ and $H^{2d-i}(X \times_k \bar{k}, \mathbf{Q}_\ell)$ via Poincaré duality.

Algebraic cycles and correspondences. An i -cycle on X is a formal sum with $\mathbf{Z}$ coefficients of closed subvarieties of X of dimension i . We denote by $\mathcal{Z}_i(X)$ the group of dimension i cycles on X . Let $\sim$ be an adequate equivalence relation (cf [1, 3.1]), which means that we can define a good intersection product on $\mathcal{Z}_i(X)$ modulo $\sim$. The finest equivalence relation is rational equivalence and the coarsest is numerical equivalence.

Given a closed subvariety Z of dimension i in X , we have by purity $H_Z^{2d-2i}(X) \simeq \mathbf{Q}$ or $\mathbf{Q}_\ell$ depending on the choice of cohomology theory. The cohomology class of Z is by definition the image of 1 under the map $H_Z^{2d-2i}(X) \rightarrow H^{2d-2i}(X)$. Extending this map by linearity, we get a map $\mathcal{Z}_i(X) \rightarrow H^{2d-2i}(X)$ called the cycle class map. Two cycles will be said to be homologically equivalent if they have same image under the cycle map. It is then a fact that homological equivalence sits in between rational equivalence and numerical equivalence.

The homology class of a cycle a will be denoted a^{hom} or sometimes with brackets $[a]$. We write $\mathcal{Z}_i^\sim(X)$ for the group of i -cycles modulo $\sim$. The Chow group $CH_i(X)$ is defined to be $\mathcal{Z}_i^{\text{rat}}(X)$. We will often write the same way a closed subscheme Z of X and the cycle it represents : if Z is a closed subscheme of X of dimension i , let Z_α denote its irreducible components and m_α be the lengths of the local rings $\mathcal{O}_{Z, Z_\alpha}$, then the cycle Z is by definition the cycle $\sum_\alpha m_\alpha Z_\alpha$. We write $CH_i(X)_\mathbf{Q}$ for $CH_i(X) \otimes \mathbf{Q}$. It is also common to write $CH_i(X)_\sim$ for those cycles that are equivalent to zero for $\sim$. For example, $CH_i(X)_{\text{hom}}$ consists of those i -cycles up to rational equivalence on X that are homologically trivial.

For X and Y in $\mathcal{V}_k$, the group of correspondences between them is

$$\text{Corr}_i^\sim(X, Y) = \bigoplus_{\alpha} \mathcal{Z}_{d_\alpha+i}^\sim(X_\alpha \times Y),$$

if $X = \coprod_{\alpha} X_\alpha$, for X_α equidimensional of dimension d_α . Composition of correspondences is given by the usual formula. If $\alpha \in \text{Corr}_i^\sim(X, Y)$ and $\beta \in \text{Corr}_i^\sim(Y, Z)$,

$$\beta \circ \alpha = (p_{X,Z})_*(p_{X,Y}^* \alpha \cdot p_{Y,Z}^* \beta)$$

where for instance $p_{X,Z}$ denotes the projection map $X \times Y \times Z \rightarrow X \times Z$, cf e.g. [19] for more details on the covariant setting. Moreover, correspondences in $\text{Corr}_i^\sim(X, Y)$ act on $\mathcal{Z}_*^{\sim'}(X)$ for any equivalence relation $\sim$ finer than $\sim'$. As such, any correspondence $\Gamma \in CH_{\dim X+k}(X \times Y)$ induces an action

$$\Gamma_* : CH_i(X) \rightarrow CH_{i+k}(Y)$$

and an action

$$\Gamma_* : H^{2\dim X-i}(X) = H_i(X) \rightarrow H_{i+2k}(Y) = H^{2\dim Y-2k-i}(Y).$$

It also induces a dual action Γ^* on $CH_*(Y)$ and on $H_*(Y)$ which is equal to the action $({}^t\Gamma)_*$ of ${}^t\Gamma \in CH_*(Y \times X)$, where ${}^t\Gamma$ is the image of Γ under the map $X \times Y \rightarrow Y \times X$, $(x, y) \mapsto (y, x)$.

Pure motives. A motive is a triple (X, p, n) with X a smooth projective variety over k , p a correspondence in $\text{Corr}_0^\sim(X \times X) \otimes \mathbf{Q}$ which is an idempotent, i.e. satisfying $p \circ p = p$, and n is an integer called the Tate twist. The category of motives $\mathcal{M}_\sim$ for the adequate equivalence relation $\sim$ has such triples for objects and morphisms are given by

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}_\sim}((X, p, n), (Y, q, m)) = q \circ \text{Corr}_{n-m}^\sim(X, Y) \circ p.$$

Let Δ_X denote the correspondence representing the diagonal in $X \times X$. We also write it sometimes id_X . Then, there is a functor $\mathcal{V}_k \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_\sim$ that sends a variety X to the motive $\mathfrak{h}(X) := (X, \Delta_X, 0)$. A map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is sent to the cycle Γ_f representing the graph $\{(x, f(x)), x \in X\}$ of f . The identity motive is $\mathbb{1} := (\text{Spec } k, \text{id}, 0)$.

The category $\mathcal{M}_\sim$ is a rigid $\otimes$ -category. Tensor product is defined as follows $(X, p, n) \otimes (Y, q, m) = (X \times Y, p \times q, m + n)$. If X has pure dimension d , the dual of the object $M = (X, p, n)$ is $M^\vee = (X, {}^tp, d - n)$. If we are given a realization functor to a Weil cohomology theory these definitions of tensor product and duality are compatible with the notions of Künneth formula and Poincaré duality.

The motive $\mathbb{L} := (\text{Spec } k, \text{id}, 1) = \mathbb{1}(1)$ is called the *Lefschetz motive* and we have $\mathfrak{h}(\mathbf{P}^1) = \mathbb{1} \oplus \mathbb{L}$. Tensoring a motive M with the Lefschetz motive $\mathbb{L}$ then amounts to performing a Tate twist, $M \otimes \mathbb{L} = M(1)$. The Lefschetz motive is invertible and in fact $\mathbb{L}^{-1} = (\text{Spec } k, \text{id}, -1)$. Moreover, for any Chow motive $M = (X, p, n)$, $CH_i(M) := p_* CH_{i-n}(X) = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbb{L}^{\otimes i}, M)$ and $H_i(M) := p_* H_{i-2n}(X)$.

Since rational equivalence is finer than homological equivalence, there is a functor $\mathcal{M}_{\text{rat}} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{hom}}$. A *Chow motive* is a motive for rational equivalence. A *homological (or Grothendieck) motive* is a motive for homological equivalence. Given a Chow motive $M = (X, p, n)$, we will write $M^{\text{hom}} = (X, p^{\text{hom}}, n)$ for its image under the above functor. Likewise, a *numerical motive* is a motive for numerical equivalence and we will write $M^{\text{num}} = (X, p^{\text{num}}, n)$ for the motive M modulo numerical equivalence.

1.2 Hodge structures and polarizations

A $\mathbf{Q}$ -Hodge structure of weight n is a finite dimensional $\mathbf{Q}$ -vector space $V_{\mathbf{Q}}$ together with a decreasing filtration $F^{\bullet}$ on $V_{\mathbf{C}} := V_{\mathbf{Q}} \otimes_{\mathbf{Q}} \mathbf{C}$ such that $F^i V_{\mathbf{C}} \oplus \overline{F^{n-i+1} V_{\mathbf{C}}} = V_{\mathbf{C}}$. For $i + j = n$, we will write $V^{i,j}$ for $F^i V_{\mathbf{C}} \cap \overline{F^j V_{\mathbf{C}}}$.

Let k denote a field of characteristic zero with a fixed embedding $k \subset \mathbf{C}$. For $X \in \mathcal{V}_k$, we consider its Betti cohomology with rational coefficients $H^*(X(\mathbf{C}), \mathbf{Q})$. It is naturally endowed with a $\mathbf{Q}$ -Hodge structure and we write $H^{i,j}(X)$ for $F^i H^{i+j}(X, \mathbf{C}) \cap \overline{F^j H^{i+j}(X, \mathbf{C})}$.

Because we adopt a covariant point of view, we will write everything in homology rather than in cohomology. In particular, if X has dimension d

$$H_{i,j}(X) := (H^{i,j}(X))^{\vee} = H^{d-i,d-j}(X)$$

and we have a Hodge decomposition for the homology groups of X :

$$H_i(X, \mathbf{C}) = H_{i,0}(X) \oplus H_{i-1,1}(X) \oplus \dots \oplus H_{1,i-1}(X) \oplus H_{0,i}(X).$$

$h_{i,j}$ denotes the Hodge number $\dim H_{i,j}(X)$.

If we are given an ample line bundle L on X (which determines a projective embedding of X), the class of L in $H_{2d-2}(X, \mathbf{Q})$, still denoted L , is called a *polarization* for X . The hard Lefschetz theorem says that the polarization induces an isomorphism

$$L^{i-d} : H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}) \xrightarrow{\simeq} H_{2d-i}(X, \mathbf{Q})$$

for all $i \geq d$. Recall that there is a non degenerate pairing

$$<, > : H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}) \otimes_{\mathbf{Q}} H_{2d-i}(X, \mathbf{Q}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}$$

defined for all i called Poincaré duality. Consequently, the bilinear form Q_i on $H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$ given by $Q_i(\alpha, \beta) = < L^{i-d}\alpha, \beta >$ is non degenerate. It induces a hermitian form H_i on the complexification $H_i(X, \mathbf{C})$ of $H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$ given by $H_i(\alpha, \beta) := (\sqrt{-1})^{2d-i} Q_i(\alpha, \beta)$.

The primitive part of $H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$ is defined to be $H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})_{\text{prim}} := \text{Ker}(L^{i-d+1} : H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}) \rightarrow H_{2d-i-2}(X, \mathbf{Q}))$. We then have the Lefschetz decomposition formula

$$H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}) = \bigoplus_{2r \leq 2d-i} L^r H_{i+2r}(X, \mathbf{Q})_{\text{prim}}.$$

The Hodge index theorem (see [42, §6.3.2]) states that the Lefschetz decomposition of the complexification $H_i(X, \mathbf{C})$ of $H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$ is orthogonal for the hermitian form H_i and so is the Hodge decomposition. Moreover, the hermitian form H_i induced on $H_i(X, \mathbf{C})_{\text{prim}}$ is definite on each component of the Hodge decomposition and more precisely, the form $H_i(C\alpha, \beta)$ is positive definite. Here C denotes the Weil operator, see [8, def 2.1.15]. We say that $H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})_{\text{prim}}$ is a *polarized Hodge structure*. The hermitian form H_i restricted to $L^r H_{i+2r}(X, \mathbf{Q})_{\text{prim}}$ coincides with the hermitian form $(-1)^r H_{i+2r}$ defined on $H_{i+2r}(X, \mathbf{Q})_{\text{prim}}$. Therefore, the Hodge structure $L^r H_{i+2r}(X, \mathbf{Q})_{\text{prim}}$ endowed with the form $(-1)^r Q_i$ is polarized.

Lemma 1.1. *Let H be a polarized rational Hodge structure and let K be a sub-Hodge structure. Then the pairing on H remains non degenerate after restriction to K .*

Proof. This is because the associated hermitian form on $H \otimes \mathbf{C}$ remains non degenerate when restricted to the pieces $K_{p,q}$ of the Hodge decomposition of $K \otimes \mathbf{C}$. $\square$

Let $p_{i,r}$ denote the orthogonal projector

$$H_*(X, \mathbf{Q}) \rightarrow L^r H_{i+2r}(X, \mathbf{Q})_{\text{prim}} \rightarrow H_*(X, \mathbf{Q})$$

with respect to the polarization L . The pairing Q restricts to a non degenerate pairing on each pieces of the Lefschetz decomposition and we have

Lemma 1.2. *Let H be a sub-Hodge structure of $H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$. If $(p_{i,r})_* H \subseteq H$ for all r then $(Q_i)_{|H}$ is non degenerate. More generally, suppose K is an orthogonal direct sum of Hodge structures K_i with respect to a form Q . Suppose that either $Q_{|K_i}$ or $-Q_{|K_i}$ defines a polarization on K_i for all i . If H is a subHodge structure of K which is equal to the direct sum of its projection on each piece K_i of K , then $Q_{|H}$ is non degenerate.*

Proof. The Hodge structure $(p_{i,r})_* H$ is a subHodge structure of the Hodge structure $L^r H_{i+2r}(X, \mathbf{Q})_{\text{prim}}$ which is polarized with respect to the form $(-1)^r Q_i$. By lemma 1.1, Q_i restricts to a non degenerate pairing on $(p_{i,r})_* H$ for all r . The assumption $(p_{i,r})_* H \subseteq H$ implies that $H = \bigoplus_{2r \leq 2d-i} (p_{i,r})_* H$. Hence, Q_i restricts to a non degenerate pairing on H . $\square$

1.3 Filtrations on cohomology

There are three decreasing filtrations on the cohomology ring of a smooth projective variety X over k each of which satisfy

$$H_i(X) = N^0 H_i(X) \supseteq N^1 H_i(X) \supseteq \dots \supseteq N^{\lfloor i/2 \rfloor} H_i(X) \supseteq N^{\lfloor i/2 \rfloor + 1} H_i(X) = 0.$$

The first two filtrations are of geometric origin while the third one can be defined for any Hodge structure.

The coniveau filtration N . This filtration is more naturally defined on cohomology. The j^{th} filtered piece of $H^i(X)$ will be denoted by $N^j H^i(X)$. It is defined as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} N^j H^i(X) &= \sum_{Z \subset X} \text{Ker} (H^i(X) \rightarrow H^i(X - Z)) \\ &= \sum_{Z \subset X} \text{Im} (H_Z^i(X) \rightarrow H^i(X)) \\ &= \sum_{f: Y \rightarrow X} \text{Im} (f_* : H^{i-2j}(Y) \rightarrow H^i(X)), \end{aligned}$$

where Z runs through all subschemes of X of codimension $\leq j$, and $f : Y \rightarrow X$ runs through all morphisms from a smooth projective variety Y of pure dimension $\leq \dim X - j$ to X . The last equality holds in characteristic zero under resolution of singularities by Hironaka. It holds in positive characteristic by de Jong's theorem on alterations, see Jannsen [13, 7.7] and [16, 6.5] for more details.

We then transcribe this definition in terms of homology and set

$$N^j H_i(X) = \sum_{f: Y \rightarrow X} \operatorname{Im} (f_* : H_i(Y) \rightarrow H_i(X)),$$

where the sum runs through all morphisms $f : Y \rightarrow X$ from a smooth projective variety Y of pure dimension $\leq i - j$ to X .

In the case X is defined over a subfield of $\mathbf{C}$, $N^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$ defines a sub-Hodge structure of $H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$.

The coniveau filtration $\tilde{N}$. This filtration is more naturally defined in homology and will appear to be more natural in our framework. By the weak Lefschetz theorem, instead of considering varieties Y of dimension $i - j$, we can consider smooth linear sections Y' of Y of dimension $i - 2j$ (or smooth intersections with sufficiently high degree hypersurfaces in the case the field k is finite). Such a section induces a surjection

$$H_{i-2j}(Y') \twoheadrightarrow H_{i-2j}(Y) \simeq H_i(Y)$$

which is induced by an algebraic correspondence if the Lefschetz conjecture holds for Y .

We thus consider families of j -cycles parametrized by Y' , $\Gamma_{Y'} \in CH_{i-j}(Y' \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ and look at the image of $(\Gamma_{Y'})_* : H_{i-2j}(Y') \rightarrow H_i(X)$. We then define

$$\tilde{N}^j H_i(X) = \sum_{\Gamma' \in CH_{i-j'}(Y' \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}} \operatorname{Im} (\Gamma'_* : H_{i-2j'}(Y') \rightarrow H_i(X)),$$

where the union runs through all smooth projective varieties Y' of dimension $i - 2j'$ with $j' \geq j$ and all correspondences $\Gamma' \in CH_{i-j'}(Y' \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$.

If Y' has dimension $i - 2j'$ with $j' \geq j$ and $\Gamma' \in CH_{i-j'}(Y' \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$, consider the cycle $\Gamma := \mathbf{P}^{j'-j} \times \Gamma' \in CH_{i-j}((\mathbf{P}^{j'-j} \times Y') \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$. It is then easy to see that $\operatorname{Im} (\Gamma'_* : H_{i-2j'}(Y') \rightarrow H_i(X)) = \operatorname{Im} (\Gamma_* : H_{i-2j}(\mathbf{P}^{j'-j} \times Y') \rightarrow H_i(X))$. Therefore, we have

$$\tilde{N}^j H_i(X) = \sum_{\Gamma \in CH_{i-j}(Y' \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}} \operatorname{Im} (\Gamma_* : H_{i-2j}(Y') \rightarrow H_i(X)),$$

where the union runs through all smooth projective varieties Y' of dimension $i - 2j$ and all correspondences $\Gamma \in CH_{i-j}(Y' \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$.

By looking at a desingularization (or alteration) of the closure of the image of Y' inside X via Γ , we see that

$$\tilde{N} \subseteq N.$$

Conjecturally, these two filtrations should agree :

Proposition 1.3. *Suppose conjecture B holds for all smooth projective varieties of dimension $\leq \dim X$. Then the filtrations N and $\tilde{N}$ coincide on the cohomology ring of X , that is*

$$N^j H_i(X) = \tilde{N}^j H_i(X)$$

for all i and j .

Proof. Assume $f : Y \rightarrow X$ is a morphism of smooth projective varieties with $\dim Y = i - j$ and let Y' be a smooth linear section of Y of dimension $i - 2j$. Since we assume that Y satisfies the Lefschetz conjecture, there exists an algebraic correspondence inducing an isomorphism $H_{i-2j}(Y) \xrightarrow{\cong} H_i(Y)$. The weak Lefschetz theorem asserts that the map $H_{i-2j}(Y') \rightarrow H_{i-2j}(Y)$ induced by the inclusion $Y' \hookrightarrow Y$ is surjective. Therefore, the composition

$$H_{i-2j}(Y') \rightarrow H_{i-2j}(Y) \xrightarrow{\cong} H_i(Y) \xrightarrow{f_*} H_i(X)$$

is induced by a correspondence $\Gamma \in CH_{i-j}(Y' \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ and maps onto the image of f_* . This shows that under the assumption of the Lefschetz conjecture the filtration $\tilde{N}$ coincides with the filtration N . $\square$

The Hodge coniveau filtration. A Hodge structure H is said to be *effective* if $H_{i,j} \neq 0$ implies both i and j are ≥ 0 . The Hodge structure $H(k)$ is the Hodge structure for which $H(k)_{i,j} = H_{i+k,j+k}$. The j^{th} filtered piece of H for the Hodge coniveau filtration denoted $N_H^j H$ is the union of the sub-Hodge structures K of H for which $K(-j)$ is effective. Clearly $N_H^j H$ defines a sub-Hodge structure of H . In the geometric case (if $k \subset \mathbf{C}$ and the Weil cohomology theory is Betti cohomology), $N_H^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$ is the maximal sub-Hodge structure of $H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$ contained in $H_{i-j,j}(X) \oplus \dots \oplus H_{j,i-j}(X)$.

It follows from the definitions that the filtration N is finer than the filtration N_H , i.e.

$$N \subseteq N_H.$$

For example, if $i \leq \dim X$ then $H_i(X) = N^1 H_i(X)$ implies $H_i(X) = N_H^1 H_i(X)$ and hence that the Hodge number $h_{i,0}(X)$ is zero. We say that the homology group $H_i(X)$ is supported in dimension $i - 1$. In the case k is algebraically closed, the generalized Hodge conjecture predicts that these two filtrations should actually coincide,

Conjecture 1.4 (Generalized Hodge Conjecture for X [11], $\text{GHC}(X)$ for short).

$$N_H^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}) = N^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}).$$

It is worth saying that in the geometric case, thanks to the existence of a polarization, the Hodge coniveau filtration is rationally split, i.e. there is a canonical decomposition

$H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}) = \bigoplus_{j=0}^{\lfloor i/2 \rfloor} \text{Gr}_{N_H}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$. Moreover if the generalized Hodge conjecture holds, the form $Q_i = \langle L^{i-d} -, - \rangle$ induces the same splitting and the Poincaré pairing

$$\text{Gr}_{N_H}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}) \otimes_{\mathbf{Q}} \text{Gr}_{N_H}^{d-i+j} H_{2d-i}(X, \mathbf{Q}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}$$

is non degenerate. This is due to the fact that the GHC implies that $N_H = \tilde{N}$ and that the above pairing for $\tilde{N}$ is non degenerate (proposition 3.5). In particular, under the GHC being true, we have for all i and j

$$\text{Gr}_{N_H}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}) = \text{Gr}_{\tilde{N}}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}).$$

The Hodge conjecture is a particular case of the generalized Hodge conjecture. It predicts that

$$N_H^i H_{2i}(X, \mathbf{Q}) = N^i H_{2i}(X, \mathbf{Q})$$

for all integers i .

Properties. Let X be a smooth projective variety defined over a subfield of $\mathbf{C}$. Then, we have for all $0 \leq j \leq i/2$

$$\tilde{N}^j H_i(X) \subseteq N^j H_i(X) \subseteq N_H^j H_i(X).$$

The first inclusion is an equality if the Lefschetz conjecture holds and the second inclusion is an equality if the generalized Hodge conjecture holds for X . If the generalized Hodge conjecture holds in general, then the three filtrations agree.

The Hodge structure $H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$ is polarized. Thus, all three filtrations on $H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$ split canonically with respect to the choice of a polarization on X .

In general, by the weak Lefschetz theorem we have

$$\tilde{N}^0 H_i(X) = N^0 H_i(X) = N_H^0 H_i(X) = H_i(X).$$

We also have

$$\tilde{N}^1 H_i(X) = H_i(X) \Rightarrow H_{i,0}(X) = 0$$

and more generally

$$\tilde{N}^j H_i(X) = H_i(X) \Rightarrow H_{i,0}(X) = \dots = H_{i-j+1,j-1}(X) = 0.$$

Finally, in characteristic zero we always have

$$\tilde{N}^{\lfloor i/2 \rfloor} H_i(X) = N^{\lfloor i/2 \rfloor} H_i(X).$$

In positive characteristic, the equality

$$\tilde{N}^i H_{2i+1}(X) = N^i H_{2i+1}(X)$$

holds if the Tate conjecture is true for dimension 1 cycles or if the Lefschetz conjecture holds (we won't use this fact).

1.4 Finite-dimensionality and filtrations on Chow groups

Bloch conjectured [7] that reciprocally to Mumford's theorem, if a surface S has vanishing geometric genus, its Chow group of 0-cycles should be “finite dimensional” or equivalently supported on a curve drawn on the surface S . This idea was later generalized and led to the notion of BBM filtrations and later on to the notion of finite dimensionality.

Finite dimensionality. Recently, Kimura [20] and independently O’Sullivan came up with the idea that Chow motives should behave like super vector spaces in the same way cohomology does. We refer to Kimura’s original article [20] as well as André’s surveys [1] and [2].

The category of Chow motives is a pseudo-abelian rigid $\otimes$ -category over $\mathbf{Q}$. It is therefore possible to define, for any of its object M , the symmetric and exterior powers $S^n M$ and $\Lambda^n M$. Indeed, define $S^n M := s_n(M)$, $\Lambda^n M = \lambda^n(M)$, where $s_n = \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n} \sigma$ and $\lambda_n = \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n} \varepsilon_\sigma \sigma$ are the required projectors in $CH_{nd}(X^n \times X^n)_{\mathbf{Q}}$. We are now able to give the crucial definition.

Definition 1.5. A motive M is said to be *oddly* (resp. *evenly*) *finite dimensional* if there exists an integer n such that $S^n M = 0$ (resp. $\Lambda^n M = 0$)

Definition 1.6. A motive M is said to be *finite dimensional* if there exists a decomposition $M = M^+ \oplus M^-$, with M^+ evenly finite dimensional and M^- oddly finite dimensional.

Such a decomposition if it exists is unique up to (non canonical) isomorphism. An important feature of finite dimensionality is the following

Proposition 1.7 (Kimura [20]). *Finite dimensionality is stable under duality, direct sum, tensor product and direct factor.*

Consequently, the full, rigid and thick sub- $\otimes$ -category of $\mathcal{M}(k)$ generated by finite dimensional objects has all of its objects finite dimensional. In particular, since a dominant morphism $f : X \rightarrow Y$ realizes $\mathfrak{h}(Y)$ as a direct factor of $\mathfrak{h}(X)$, we see that if $\mathfrak{h}(X)$ is finite dimensional then so is $\mathfrak{h}(Y)$.

Important examples of motives of finite dimension are given by the motives of abelian varieties. The structure of the motive of an abelian motive was elucidated by Shermenev, Lieberman and Künneman. For an abelian variety A of dimension g over k there exists a unique decomposition $\mathfrak{h}(A) = \bigoplus_0^{2d} \mathfrak{h}^i(A)$ such that for any integer n , multiplication by n on A induces multiplication by n^i on $\mathfrak{h}^i(A)$. Moreover, the diagonal correspondence $\mathfrak{h}(A^i) \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}(A)$ induces an isomorphism $S^i \mathfrak{h}^1(A) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathfrak{h}^i(A)$. In particular, we observe that $S^{2g+1} \mathfrak{h}^1(A) = 0$ and hence that $\mathfrak{h}(A)$ is finite dimensional. Thus, the motive of an abelian variety is finite dimensional. Write $\mathcal{M}_{Ab}(k)$ for the full rigid thick sub- $\otimes$ -category generated by the Artin motives and the motives of abelian varieties. This is called the category of *motives of abelian type*. Note that for a curve C , $\mathfrak{h}^1(C)$ is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{h}^1(J(C))$ where

$J(C)$ stands for the Jacobian of C . Since every abelian variety is dominated by the Jacobian of a curve, the category $\mathcal{M}_{Ab}(k)$ is generated (as a full, rigid and thick $\otimes$ -subcategory) by the $\mathfrak{h}^1$'s of curves. In particular, any variety dominated by a product of curve is finite dimensional.

The notion of finite dimensionality has become unavoidable, partly because of the nilpotence property it implies (and this is the property we will be using all along the paper). Precisely, we have the following conjecture

Conjecture 1.8 (Nilpotence Conjecture $N(X)$). *If X is a d -dimensional smooth projective variety, then $\text{Ker}(CH_d(X \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}} \rightarrow H_{2d}(X \times X, \mathbf{Q}))$ is a nilpotent ideal.*

This conjecture implies that the functor $\mathcal{M}_{rat} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{hom}$ is conservative. In particular, there should be no phantom objects, i.e. no non-trivial objects whose homology is zero. Voevodsky [40] and Voisin [41] independently proved that a correspondence $f \in CH_d(X \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ which is algebraically equivalent to 0 is nilpotent.

The nilpotence property above is also important for the following reason. Let M be a Chow motive and M^{hom} its image in the category of homological motives. Let $\text{id} = \pi_0^{\text{hom}} \oplus \dots \oplus \pi_k^{\text{hom}}$ be a decomposition of $\text{id}_{M^{\text{hom}}} \in \text{End}(M^{\text{hom}})$ into a sum of orthogonal idempotents. Then if the kernel of $\text{End}(M) \rightarrow \text{End}(M^{\text{hom}})$ is nilpotent, the decomposition lifts to a decomposition of $\text{id}_M : M \rightarrow M$ into a sum of orthogonal idempotents cf. [15, Prop. 5.3]. Such a lift is not unique in general. However, given any two lifts $\{\pi_i\}$ and $\{\pi'_i\}$, there exists a nilpotent correspondence n such that $\pi_i = (1 + n) \circ \pi'_i \circ (1 + n)^{-1}$ for all $0 \leq i \leq k$. This is summed up in the following.

Lemma 1.9 ([17], lemma 3.1). *Let $\sim$ and $\sim'$ be two adequate equivalence relations such that $\sim$ is finer than $\sim'$. Let $M \in \mathcal{M}_{\sim}$ and assume the kernel of the map $\text{End}(M) \rightarrow \text{End}(M_{\sim'})$ is a nilpotent ideal. Then,*

1. *If $M_{\sim'} = 0$, then $M = 0$.*
2. *Any orthogonal sum of idempotents in $\text{End}(M_{\sim'})$ can be lifted to an orthogonal sum of idempotents in $\text{End}(M)$ and any two lifting are conjugate by an element lying above the identity in $\text{End}(M_{\sim'})$.*
3. *If the image of $f \in \text{End}(M)$ is invertible in $\text{End}(M_{\sim'})$ then so is f .*

Theorem 1.10 (Kimura [20], Prop. 7.2). *Assume the Chow motive of the variety X is finite dimensional. Then the conjecture $N(X)$ is true.*

Thus, Kimura and O'Sullivan were led up to formulate the following

Conjecture 1.11 (Kimura-O'Sullivan). *Every Chow motive is finite dimensional.*

Finite dimensionality in the sense of Kimura has been related to other notions in the world of motives. Guletskii and Pedrini [12] proved that for a surface S with vanishing geometric genus the Bloch conjecture for S is equivalent to finite dimensionality for $\mathfrak{h}(S)$. This result was also essentially proved by M. Saito in [35]. Building on results of Geisser [10], Kahn proved that for motives over finite fields, the Kimura conjecture together with the strong Tate conjecture imply that rational and numerical equivalence agree, cf. [18] and also [17] for a more precise statement. Finally, André and Kahn [3] proved that assuming the standard conjectures the BBM conjectures imply the Kimura conjecture.

Filtration on Chow groups. It is conjectured that the Künneth projectors in homology are algebraic, i.e. that each projection map $H_*(X) \rightarrow H_i(X) \rightarrow H_*(X)$ should be induced by an algebraic correspondence $\pi_i \in CH_d(X \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$. For X in $\mathcal{V}_k$, the Künneth conjecture implies that the homological motive of X decomposes as $\mathfrak{h}^{\text{hom}}(X) = \bigoplus_i \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{hom}}(X)$, where $H_j(\mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{hom}}(X)) = H_j(X)$ if $i = j$ and is zero if $i \neq j$. The Künneth conjecture for X is implied by the Lefschetz conjecture for X (cf. [22]) which itself is an obvious consequence of the Hodge conjecture for $X \times X$. The Chow-Künneth conjecture for a d -dimensional $X \in \mathcal{V}_k$ asserts that it should be possible to choose the correspondences π_i for X to be pairwise orthogonal projectors with sum equal to id_X modulo rational equivalence (and not just homological equivalence). The Chow-Künneth conjecture for X is implied by the Künneth conjecture for X together with the nilpotence conjecture for X [15, Proposition 5.3].

We can now formulate Murre's conjecture. This conjecture for all $X \in \mathcal{V}_k$ is equivalent to the conjecture of Bloch-Beilinson for all $X \in \mathcal{V}_k$, see [15]. It has the advantage of not involving any functoriality properties.

Conjecture 1.12 (Murre, [30]).

- (A) *Every smooth projective variety X has a Chow-Künneth decomposition.*
- (B) *Vanishing Conjectures. The correspondences π_i act as 0 on $CH_l(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ for $i < 2l$ and for $i > \dim(X) + l$*
- (C) *The filtration F defined by $F^k CH_l(X)_{\mathbf{Q}} = \text{Ker}(\pi_{2l}) \cap \dots \cap \text{Ker}(\pi_{2l+k-1})$ is independent of the choice of the π_i 's.*
- (D) *$F^1 CH_l(X)_{\mathbf{Q}} = CH_l(X)_{\text{hom}, \mathbf{Q}}$, for all l .*

We finish this section by proving two lemmas which will be used later in the paper. These lemmas are to be compared with condition (C) of Murre's filtration.

Lemma 1.13. *Let X be a d -dimensional smooth projective variety whose Chow motive is finite dimensional in the sense of Kimura. Let π be a projector and γ be a correspondence in $CH_d(X \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$, both acting on $CH_*(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$. Let also S be a subset of $\text{Ker } \gamma$ which is stabilized by all nilpotent correspondences in $CH_d(X \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$. Then, if π and γ have same homology class, $S \subseteq \text{Ker } \pi$.*

Proof. Because X is supposed to be finite-dimensional in the sense of Kimura, by theorem 1.10, there exists a nilpotent correspondence $n \in CH_d(X \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ such that $\pi = \gamma + n$. Let N be the nilpotent index of n . Let $x \in S \subseteq \text{Ker } \gamma$. Then $\pi(x) = (\gamma + n)(x)$. Therefore, $\pi^{\circ N}(x) = (\gamma + n)^{\circ N}(x)$. By assumption n stabilizes S which is a subset of the kernel of γ . Moreover, $n^{\circ N} = 0$. Hence $\pi(x) = 0$, that is $x \in \text{Ker } \pi$. $\square$

Lemma 1.14. *Let X be a d -dimensional smooth projective variety whose Chow motive is finite dimensional in the sense of Kimura. Let π and π' be two projectors in $CH_d(X \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$, both acting on $CH_*(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$. Suppose $\text{Ker } \pi'$ is stabilized by all nilpotent correspondences in $CH_d(X \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$. Then, if π and π' have same homology class, $\text{Ker } \pi = \text{Ker } \pi'$.*

Proof. The previous lemma shows that $\text{Ker } \pi' \subseteq \text{Ker } \pi$. By lemma 1.9, there exists a nilpotent correspondence $n \in CH_d(X \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ such that $\pi = (1+n) \circ \pi' \circ (1+n)^{-1}$. Therefore, $\text{Ker } \pi = (1+n)(\text{Ker } \pi')$ and we conclude that $\text{Ker } \pi \subseteq \text{Ker } \pi'$ since by assumption n stabilizes $\text{Ker } \pi'$. $\square$

Remark 1.15. For example, in lemma 1.13, if there is an adequate equivalence relation $\sim$ such that $CH_l(X)_{\sim, \mathbf{Q}}$ is in the kernel of γ for some l then this gives a subset S which is stabilized by all correspondences in $CH_d(X \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ (and *a fortiori* by all nilpotent correspondences). In light of lemma 1.14, if one is ready to assume the Künneth conjecture for X together with Kimura's conjecture for X then condition (C) of Murre's conjecture boils down to proving that each step of the filtration for a particular choice of Chow-Künneth projectors is preserved by the action of correspondences on X . More generally, assuming the Künneth conjecture and Kimura's conjecture for all smooth projective varieties, condition (C) of Murre's conjecture boils down to proving that each step of the filtration for a particular choice of Chow-Künneth projectors is preserved by the action of correspondences and hence defines an adequate equivalence relation in the sense of [1, 3.1.1.1].

2 Refined (Chow-)Künneth decompositions

Let X be a smooth projective variety satisfying the Künneth conjecture. In this section, we consider two filtrations N and $\tilde{N}$ on the weighted components $\mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)$ of the numerical motive of X and show how conjecturally they should coincide.

These filtrations are related to the same filtrations defined on the cohomology of X (see §1.3) and we explain under which assumptions they should be compatible. If the generalized Hodge conjecture holds then these filtrations give a Hodge coniveau filtration on the motive of X .

2.1 The filtration N

We refer to [19, §7.7] for this section, as well as the concise exposition of André [1, §8] concerning the coniveau filtration N on numerical motives.

1. Let $\mathcal{M}_{\text{num}}(k)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ denote the category of pure motives over k for numerical equivalence. By a famous result of Jannsen [14] this category is abelian and semi-simple, meaning that any numerical motive decomposes as the sum of its isotypical components.

Definition 2.1. A numerical motive $M \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{num}}(k)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ is said to be *effective* if it is isomorphic to a motive of the form $(X, \pi^{\text{num}}, 0)$. In particular, any motive is a twisted form of an effective motive.

The notion of effectivity allows to define the notion of coniveau for numerical motives.

Definition 2.2. Let $j \in \mathbf{Z}$ be any integer. The numerical motive M is said to have *coniveau* $\geq j$ if the motive $M(-j)$ is effective.

Thanks to semi-simplicity it is now possible to define the *coniveau filtration* for numerical motives. By definition $N^j M$ is the biggest subobject of M having coniveau $\geq j$. In particular, M is effective if and only if $M = N^0 M$. This filtration has the nice and crucial property of being canonically split, that is

$$M = \bigoplus_j \text{Gr}_N^j M.$$

Indeed (see lemme 8.1.2.2 of [1]), for any two numerical motives M and M' ,

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{num}}}(\text{Gr}_N^{j-1} M, N^j M') = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{num}}}(\text{Gr}_N^{j-1} M(j), N^j M'(j)) = 0$$

since $N^j M'(j)$ is effective and $\text{Gr}_N^{j-1} M(j)$ has no effective summand.

2. Let us now focus on the case when X is a smooth projective variety of dimension d over a field k . Assume that the Künneth conjecture $\text{C}(X)$ holds for X . This means that the homological motive $\mathfrak{h}^{\text{hom}}(X)$ of X admits a Künneth decomposition (or weight decomposition) $\mathfrak{h}^{\text{hom}}(X) = \bigoplus_i \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{hom}}(X)$ where $H_*(\mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{hom}}(X)) = H_i(X)$. We say that $\mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{hom}}(X)$ is purely of weight i . This decomposition induces a weight decomposition of the numerical motive of X

$$\mathfrak{h}^{\text{num}}(X) = \bigoplus_i \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X).$$

Furthermore, the motive $\mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)$ admits a finer decomposition into the graded parts for the coniveau filtration

$$\mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X) = \bigoplus_j \text{Gr}_N^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X).$$

The motive $\text{Gr}_N^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)$ being a direct summand of $\mathfrak{h}^{\text{num}}(X)$, it is possible to write

$$\text{Gr}_N^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X) = (X, \pi_{i,j}^{\text{num}}, 0)$$

for some projector $\pi_{i,j}^{\text{num}} \in \mathcal{Z}_d^{\text{num}}(X \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$. Moreover, by definition of the coniveau grading, $\text{Gr}_N^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)(-j)$ is an effective motive whereas $\text{Gr}_N^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)(-j-1)$ is not.

Definition 2.3. The above decomposition

$$\mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X) = \bigoplus_{j=0}^{\lfloor i/2 \rfloor} (X, \pi_{i,j}^{\text{num}}, 0)$$

is called the *refined Künneth decomposition* of the numerical motive $\mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)$. Since the filtration N is canonically split, such projectors are unique and in particular are central.

The coniveau filtration for $\mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)$ stops at the rank $\lfloor i/2 \rfloor$ (and thus legitimizes the indices in the sum of definition 2.3). Indeed, let S be a direct summand of $\mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)$ such that $S(-j)$ is effective. Then $S(-j)$ has non-negative weight, i.e. $i - 2j \geq 0$. If i is even, $N^{i/2}\mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X) = \text{Gr}_N^{i/2}\mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)$ is the biggest Artin submotive of $\mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)$. If i is odd, $N^{(i-1)/2}\mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X) = \text{Gr}_N^{(i-1)/2}\mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)$ is the biggest submotive of $\mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)$ isomorphic to the $\mathfrak{h}_1^{\text{num}}$ of an abelian variety (see proposition 2.6).

Assume that homological and numerical equivalence agree for all smooth projective varieties. We will prove (proposition 2.9 together with proposition 2.5) that the coniveau filtration on the numerical motive of X is compatible with the coniveau filtration on cohomology (which is the reason why both filtrations are called N):

$$H_*(N^j\mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)) = N^j H_i(X).$$

3. If X satisfies the Künneth conjecture then the sign conjecture $S(X)$ holds, i.e. the projection $H_*(X) \rightarrow \bigoplus_i H_{2i}(X) \hookrightarrow H_*(X)$ is algebraic (and *a fortiori* the projection $H_*(X) \rightarrow \bigoplus_i H_{2i+1}(X) \hookrightarrow H_*(X)$). As a consequence, the kernel of the map

$$\text{End}_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{hom}}}(X) \rightarrow \text{End}_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{num}}}(X)$$

is a nilpotent ideal (see [14, Corollary 1] as well as the discussion in [17, §2]).

Thus, by lemma 1.9, the refined Künneth decomposition of the numerical motive of X lifts to a refined Künneth decomposition of the homological motive of X which is unique up to non canonical isomorphism. We write

$$\mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{hom}}(X) = \bigoplus_{j=0}^{\lfloor i/2 \rfloor} (X, \pi_{i,j}^{\text{hom}}, 0)$$

for such a decomposition.

4. The finite dimensionality property for the Chow motive $\mathfrak{h}(X)$ together with the assumption of $C(X)$ imply that the kernel of the map $\text{End}_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{rat}}}(X) \rightarrow \text{End}_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{num}}}(X)$ is a nilpotent ideal. This allows to lift the decomposition of the numerical motive $\mathfrak{h}^{\text{num}}(X) = \bigoplus (X, \pi_{i,j}^{\text{num}}, 0)$ into a decomposition $\mathfrak{h}(X) = \bigoplus (X, \pi_{i,j}, 0)$ of the Chow motive of X . We

are thus able to state the following which is a slightly improved version of a result obtained by Kahn, Murre and Pedrini (besides the Lefschetz isomorphisms). The difference in our approach is that we don't need $D(X \times X)$ to hold since we work directly at the level of the numerical motive of X rather than at the level of the homological motive of X .

Theorem 2.4 ([19], Theorem 7.3). *Let X be a smooth projective variety of dimension d whose Chow motive is finite-dimensional. We assume $C(X)$. Then*

1. *There exists a self-dual Chow-Künneth decomposition $\mathfrak{h}(X) = \bigoplus \mathfrak{h}_i(X)$ (${}^t\pi_i = \pi_{2d-i}$).*
2. *For each $i \in [0, 2d]$ there exists a further decomposition*

$$\mathfrak{h}_i(X) \simeq \bigoplus_{j=0}^{\lfloor i/2 \rfloor} (X, \pi_{i,j}, 0)$$

such that, for each j , $(X, \pi_{i,j}^{\text{num}}, -j)$ is effective but $(X, \pi_{i,j}^{\text{num}}, -j-1)$ is not effective.

3. *Let $(\pi_{i,j})$ be the orthogonal set of projectors defining this decomposition. If $(\pi'_{i,j})$ is another such set of projectors, then there exists a correspondence n , homologically equivalent to 0, such that $\pi'_{i,j} = (1+n)\pi_{i,j}(1+n)^{-1}$ for all (i,j) . In particular, the motives $(X, \pi_{i,j}, 0)$ are unique up to isomorphism.*

2.2 The filtration $\tilde{N}$

1. Let X be a smooth projective variety satisfying $C(X)$. Then, we define a decreasing filtration $\tilde{N}$ on the numerical motive of X by the formula

$$\tilde{N}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X) := \sum \text{Im}(\Gamma_* : \mathfrak{h}^{\text{num}}(Y)(j) \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)),$$

where the sum runs through all smooth projective varieties Y with $\dim Y = i - 2j$ and all correspondences $\Gamma \in \mathcal{Z}_{i-j}^{\text{num}}(Y \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$.

Remark that as for the case of the filtration $\tilde{N}$ defined on cohomology (§1.3), this sum coincides with the same sum but this time running through all smooth projective varieties Y of dimension $i - 2j'$ with $j' \geq j$ and all correspondences $\Gamma \in \mathcal{Z}_{i-j'}^{\text{num}}(Y \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$.

By semi-simplicity of $\text{End}(\mathfrak{h}^{\text{num}}(X))$, this filtration splits as

$$\mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X) = \bigoplus_{j=0}^{\lfloor i/2 \rfloor} \text{Gr}_{\tilde{N}}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X).$$

The motive $\text{Gr}_{\tilde{N}}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)$ being a direct summand of $\mathfrak{h}^{\text{num}}(X)$, it is possible to write

$$\text{Gr}_{\tilde{N}}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X) = (X, \tilde{\pi}_{i,j}^{\text{num}}, 0)$$

for some projector $\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}^{\text{num}} \in \mathcal{Z}_d^{\text{num}}(X \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$. (We do not claim that the grading associated to the filtration $\tilde{N}$ is canonical.)

2. In general the filtration $\tilde{N}$ is seen to be finer than the filtration N , i.e.

$$\tilde{N}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X) \subseteq N^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)$$

for all i and j . The following proposition shows that conjecturally the filtration $\tilde{N}$ coincides with the filtration N .

Proposition 2.5. *Assume the Lefschetz conjecture holds for all smooth projective varieties. Then we have*

$$\tilde{N}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X) = N^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)$$

for all i and j .

Proof. The Lefschetz conjecture for a smooth projective variety Y of dimension e implies a version of the weak Lefschetz theorem : if $\iota : H \hookrightarrow Y$ is a smooth hyperplane section of Y (which exists after possibly taking a finite extension of k) then the morphism $\iota_* : \mathfrak{h}_{e-1}^{\text{num}}(H) \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{e-1}^{\text{num}}(Y)$ is surjective (if Y satisfies the Lefschetz conjecture then so does H and thus it is possible to talk about weights for H). Indeed if L denotes the Lefschetz isomorphism $\mathfrak{h}_{e-1}^{\text{num}}(Y) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathfrak{h}_{e+1}^{\text{num}}(Y)$, then by definition of L the composition $\iota_* \circ \iota^* \circ L : \mathfrak{h}_{e-1}^{\text{num}}(Y) \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{e-1}^{\text{num}}(Y)$ is identity.

Let S be a summand of $N^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)$. Then, $S(-j)$ is effective and hence there exists a smooth projective variety Y and a projector π such that $S(-j) \simeq (Y, \pi, 0)$. Now, $S(-j)$ has weight $i - 2j$. Therefore, since the Künneth projectors are central, if Y' is a smooth linear section of Y of dimension $i - 2j$ then the inclusion map $\iota : Y' \hookrightarrow Y$ induces a surjection $\mathfrak{h}_{i-2j}^{\text{num}}(Y') \twoheadrightarrow S(-j)$.

Therefore, there exists a smooth projective scheme Z of pure dimension $i - 2j$ and a surjective morphism $h_{i-2j}^{\text{num}}(Z) \twoheadrightarrow N^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)$, hence showing that

$$\tilde{N}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X) \supseteq N^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X).$$

□

We have better results concerning the last step of the filtration.

Proposition 2.6. *Assume $C(X)$, then we have*

$$\tilde{N}^{\lfloor i/2 \rfloor} \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X) = N^{\lfloor i/2 \rfloor} \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)$$

for all i .

Proof. If $i = 2k$ is even and Y is a smooth projective scheme of pure dimension k , then we know that there exists a smooth 0-dimensional scheme Y' and an isomorphism $\mathfrak{h}_0(Y)(k) \simeq \mathfrak{h}_{2k}(Y)$. This isomorphism descends to numerical equivalence to give an isomorphism $\mathfrak{h}^{\text{num}}(Y')(k) \simeq \mathfrak{h}_{2k}^{\text{num}}(Y)$ showing the proposition in the case i is even.

In the case $i = 2k + 1$ is odd and Y is a smooth projective scheme of pure dimension $k + 1$, Murre's construction of the Picard projector (see [29, 37]) gives a smooth projective 1-dimensional scheme Y' with an isomorphism $\mathfrak{h}_1(Y')(k) \simeq \mathfrak{h}_{2k+1}(Y)$ which descends to an isomorphism modulo numerical equivalence thus completing the proof of the proposition. $\square$

3. Since we are assuming $C(X)$, this decomposition lifts to the homological motive of X (lemma 1.9)

$$\mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{hom}}(X) = \bigoplus_{j=0}^{\lfloor i/2 \rfloor} (X, \tilde{\pi}_{i,j}^{\text{hom}}, 0).$$

In case the base field has characteristic zero, if we assume furthermore that $B(X)$ holds, we will prove (theorem 4.7)

$$H_*(\tilde{N}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)) = \tilde{N}^j H_i(X).$$

4. If we assume $C(X)$ and moreover that $\mathfrak{h}(X)$ is finite dimensional then this decomposition lifts to a refined Chow-Künneth decomposition

$$\mathfrak{h}(X) = \bigoplus_{i,j} (X, \tilde{\pi}_{i,j}, 0)$$

which is unique up to isomorphism.

2.3 Coniveau filtrations on homology vs. numerical motives

We prove that if homological and numerical equivalence agree then the filtration N defined on cohomology and the one defined for numerical motives are compatible. This result is quoted without proof in the discussion following 8.2.1.2 in [1] and is certainly known to the expert.

Notice that, since $D \Rightarrow B$, under such assumption we always have $N = \tilde{N}$.

Given a homological motive $M \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{hom}}(k)$, we write $\bar{M}$ its image in $\mathcal{M}_{\text{num}}(k)$.

Lemma 2.7. *Let $f : M \rightarrow N$ be a morphism of homological motives. Suppose that $\text{End}_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{hom}}}(N) = \text{End}_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{num}}}(\bar{N})$ and that $\text{Im } \bar{f} = \bar{N}_1$. Denote by N_1 any lift of $\bar{N}_1$. Then, there exists a morphism $g : N \rightarrow M$ such that $f \circ g \in \text{End}(N)$ is the projector on N_1 and $g \circ f \circ g \circ f \in \text{End}(M)$ is a projector on a homological motive isomorphic to N_1 .*

Proof. Since the category of motives modulo numerical equivalence is semi-simple, the morphism $\bar{f}$ decomposes as the sum of an invertible morphism and of the zero morphism, see [3, A.2.13]. Let's thus write

$$\bar{f} = \varphi \oplus 0 : \bar{M}_1 \oplus \bar{M}_2 \rightarrow \bar{N}_1 \oplus \bar{N}_2,$$

where $\varphi : \bar{M}_1 \rightarrow \bar{N}$ is an isomorphism. Consider any lift $g : N \rightarrow M$ modulo homological equivalence for the morphism $\varphi^{-1} \oplus 0 : \bar{N}_1 \oplus \bar{N}_2 \rightarrow \bar{M}_1 \oplus \bar{M}_2$. Then $f \circ g \in \text{End}_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{hom}}}(N)$ has reduction $\overline{f \circ g} = \bar{f} \circ \bar{g} = \pi_{\bar{N}_1} \in \text{End}_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{num}}}(\bar{N})$ where $\pi_{\bar{N}_1}$ denotes the projector on $\bar{N}_1$. Since $\text{End}_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{hom}}}(N) = \text{End}_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{num}}}(\bar{N})$, this shows that $f \circ g$ is a projector with image N_1 .

Now, $g \circ f \circ g \circ f = g \circ \pi_{N_1} \circ f$ and $(g \circ f \circ g \circ f) \circ (g \circ f \circ g \circ f) = g \circ \pi_{N_1} \circ \pi_{N_1} \circ \pi_{N_1} \circ f = g \circ \pi_{N_1} \circ f = g \circ f \circ g \circ f$. Hence, $g \circ f \circ g \circ f$ is a projector and it is not too difficult to see that it projects onto a motive isomorphic to N_1 (compare with [39, Prop. 1.1]). $\square$

Proposition 2.8. *Let H_* denote a Weil cohomology theory over the field k . Let $f : M \rightarrow N$ be a morphism of homological motives. Suppose that $\text{End}_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{hom}}}(N) = \text{End}_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{num}}}(\bar{N})$ and that $\text{Im } \bar{f} = \bar{N}_1$. Then,*

$$f_* H_*(M) \supseteq H_*(N_1)$$

and equality holds if $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{hom}}}(M, N) = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{num}}}(\bar{M}, \bar{N})$.

Proof. By the previous lemma, there exists a morphism $g : M \rightarrow N$ such that $f \circ g$ is equal to the projector π_{N_1} . Applying the functor H_* to $N = N_1 \oplus N_2$, we get that $\text{Im}(f_* \circ g_*) = H_*(N_1)$. Clearly, $\text{Im } f_* \supseteq \text{Im}(f_* \circ g_*)$. Hence $f_* H_*(M) \supseteq H_*(N_1)$.

In general by the previous lemma $f : M \rightarrow N$ decomposes as

$$\begin{pmatrix} \phi & * \\ * & * \end{pmatrix} : M_1 \oplus M_2 \rightarrow N_1 \oplus N_2$$

where $\phi : M_1 \rightarrow N_1$ is an isomorphism and each $*$ is a morphism which is numerically trivial. In the case $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{hom}}}(M, N) = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{num}}}(\bar{M}, \bar{N})$, the $*$'s are zero hence concluding the proof. $\square$

As a corollary, we get

Proposition 2.9. *Let X be a smooth projective variety. Assume $D(X \times X)$. Then,*

$$\tilde{N}^j H_i(X) \supseteq H_*(\tilde{N}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X))$$

for all integers i and j and equality holds if conjecture D holds for all smooth projective varieties.

Proof. Let Y be a smooth projective scheme of dimension $i - 2j$ and $\gamma \in CH_{i-j}(Y \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ be a correspondence such that

$$\text{Im}(\gamma_* : H_{i-2j}(Y) \rightarrow H_*(X)) = \tilde{N}^j H_i(X)$$

and

$$\text{Im}(\gamma : \mathfrak{h}^{\text{num}}(Y) \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)) = \tilde{N}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X).$$

Because we are assuming $D(X \times X)$, the conditions of the previous proposition are satisfied. Therefore, $\gamma_* H_i(Y) \supseteq H_*(\tilde{N}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X))$, i.e. $\tilde{N}^j H_i(X) \supseteq H_*(\tilde{N}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X))$, and equality holds if conjecture D holds. $\square$

Remark 2.10. We will see later that much more is true in characteristic zero for the filtration $\tilde{N}$ on Betti cohomology. Assuming $B(X)$ only, we will prove (see theorem 4.7) $H_*(\tilde{N}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)) = \tilde{N}^j H_i(X)$.

2.4 The filtration N_H

All this work started in an attempt to study a “motivic” Hodge decomposition for pure Chow motives. Of course, this is certainly not possible for the usual Hodge filtration as shown by Grothendieck [11]. Rather we used the Hodge coniveau filtration.

So, let $k \subset \mathbf{C}$ be an algebraically closed field and let X be a d -dimensional smooth projective variety. The filtration N_H on the homology group $H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$ canonically splits:

$$H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}) = \bigoplus_{j=0}^{\lfloor i/2 \rfloor} \text{Gr}_{N_H}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}).$$

Assume now the Hodge conjecture to be true for all smooth projective complex varieties. Each projector $H_*(X, \mathbf{Q}) \rightarrow \text{Gr}_{N_H}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}) \hookrightarrow H_*(X, \mathbf{Q})$ is then the homology class of an algebraic cycle on $X \times X$. If X is assumed to be finite dimensional in the sense of Kimura then this decomposition lifts to the Chow motive of X , thus giving a desired decomposition.

In order to draw consequences on the geometry of X it is then natural to interpret geometrically the Hodge coniveau filtration. This is precisely the content of the generalized Hodge conjecture. Concretely, the filtration $\tilde{N}$ is more appropriate than the usual coniveau filtration N since it brings into play the middle cohomology groups of some varieties and these are “self-dual”.

If one is ready to admit the generalized Hodge conjecture, then most results presented here can be formulated with a unique filtration, the Hodge coniveau filtration. However, at least in the characteristic zero case, most of our results require only the Lefschetz conjecture to be true for the variety X considered (and finite dimensionality for X).

3 Some consequences of $B(X)$

Let k be an arbitrary field and X be a smooth projective variety over k satisfying the Künneth conjecture. Recall that the coniveau filtration N on $\mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)$ splits canonically. Under $B(X)$, it is proved [1, lemme 8.1.2.3] that there is an isomorphism

$$(\text{Gr}_N^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X))^{\vee}(i) \simeq \text{Gr}_N^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X).$$

If now $k \subset \mathbf{C}$, we are going to show much stronger results under the assumption of $B(X)$. We will prove that the coniveau filtration $\tilde{N}$ on $H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$ splits canonically (proposition 3.4) and that there is an isomorphism

$$(\text{Gr}_{\tilde{N}}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}))^{\vee} \simeq \text{Gr}_{\tilde{N}}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$$

induced by an algebraic correspondence on X .

3.1 The filtration N on numerical motives

Let k be any field.

Proposition 3.1 (lemme 8.1.2.3 in [1]). *Assume $B(X)$. Then,*

$$(\mathrm{Gr}_N^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\mathrm{num}}(X))^\vee(i) \simeq \mathrm{Gr}_N^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\mathrm{num}}(X).$$

Moreover, $(\mathrm{Gr}_N^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\mathrm{num}}(X))^\vee(d) = \mathrm{Gr}_N^{d-i+j} \mathfrak{h}_{2d-i}^{\mathrm{num}}(X)$.

Proof. By Poincaré duality followed by the Lefschetz isomorphism, we have

$$\mathfrak{h}_i^{\mathrm{num}}(X)^\vee = \mathfrak{h}_{2d-i}^{\mathrm{num}}(X)(-d) \simeq \mathfrak{h}_i^{\mathrm{num}}(X)(-i).$$

Hence, if S is a simple summand of $\mathrm{Gr}_N^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\mathrm{num}}(X)$ then $S(-j)$ is effective if and only if $S^\vee(i-j)$ is effective. This settles the first formula. The proof of the second formula goes along the same lines. $\square$

If X is moreover supposed to have a finite dimensional Chow motive, the refined Künneth decomposition of $\mathfrak{h}^{\mathrm{num}}(X)$ lifts to a refined CK decomposition of $\mathfrak{h}(X)$. Under such assumptions, the kernel of the map $\mathrm{End}(\mathfrak{h}(X)) \rightarrow \mathrm{End}(\mathfrak{h}^{\mathrm{num}}(X))$ is nilpotent and thus reflects the isomorphisms. Hence, the Lefschetz morphism $(X, \pi_{i,j}, d-i) \rightarrow (X, \pi_{2d-i, d-i+j}, 0)$ is an isomorphism giving

Corollary 3.2 ([19], 7.7.3). *Assume $B(X)$ and $\mathfrak{h}(X)$ is finite dimensional. Given a smooth hyperplane section $\iota : Z \hookrightarrow X$ the corresponding Lefschetz operator $L = \iota_* \circ \iota^* : \mathfrak{h}(X) \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}(X)(1)$ induces an isomorphism $\mathfrak{h}_{2d-i}(X) \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}(X) \xrightarrow{L^{d-i}} \mathfrak{h}(X)(d-i) \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_i(X)(d-i)$ which itself induces an isomorphism*

$$(X, \pi_{2d-i, d-i+j}, 0) \xrightarrow{\simeq} (X, \pi_{i,j}, d-i).$$

3.2 The filtration $\tilde{N}$ on Betti cohomology

The field k is any subfield of $\mathbf{C}$ and H_* is Betti cohomology. If X is a smooth projective variety of dimension d , the choice of a polarization L endows $H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$ with a form Q_i defined by $Q_i(\alpha, \beta) = \langle L_*^{i-d} \alpha, \beta \rangle$ for all α and β in $H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$. If i and r are fixed integers, recall (§1.2) that $p_{i,r}$ is the orthogonal projector $H_*(X, \mathbf{Q}) \rightarrow L^r H_{i+2r}(X, \mathbf{Q})_{\mathrm{prim}} \rightarrow H_*(X, \mathbf{Q})$ with respect to the form Q_i on $H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$ induced by L .

Lemma 3.3. *Assume $B(X)$. Then*

$$\tilde{N}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}) = \bigoplus_{2r \leq 2d-i} (p_{i,r})_* \tilde{N}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}).$$

Proof. Kleiman showed [22, theorem 4.1.(3)] that assuming $B(X)$ the projectors $p_{i,r}$ are induced by algebraic correspondences $P_{i,r} \in CH_d(X \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$. Therefore, $(p_{i,r})_* \tilde{N}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}) = (P_{i,r})_* \tilde{N}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$. But then, by definition of the filtration $\tilde{N}$, we have $(P_{i,r})_* \tilde{N}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}) \subseteq \tilde{N}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$. $\square$

Lemma 3.3 together with lemma 1.2 yield

Proposition 3.4. *Assume $B(X)$. Then the coniveau filtration $\tilde{N}$ on $H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$ splits canonically with respect to Q_i (and the splitting is the same as the one induced by a polarization on $H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$):*

$$H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}) = \bigoplus_{j=0}^{\lfloor i/2 \rfloor} \mathrm{Gr}_{\tilde{N}}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$$

and the form Q_i restricts to a non degenerate form on each piece $\mathrm{Gr}_{\tilde{N}}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$.

Proposition 3.5. *Assume $B(X)$. Then for all i and j the pairing*

$$\mathrm{Gr}_{\tilde{N}}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}) \otimes \mathrm{Gr}_{\tilde{N}}^{d-i+j} H_{2d-i}(X, \mathbf{Q}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}$$

is non degenerate.

Proof. Let $\iota : H \hookrightarrow X$ be a smooth hyperplane section of X , let Γ_{ι} be the graph of ι in $CH_{d-1}(H \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ and let $L := {}^t \Gamma_{\iota} \circ \Gamma_{\iota} \in CH_{d-1}(X \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} L_*^{d-i} \tilde{N}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}) &= \sum_{\Gamma \in CH_{i-j}(Y \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}} \mathrm{Im} (L_*^{d-i} \circ \Gamma_* : H_{i-2j}(Y, \mathbf{Q}) \rightarrow H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})) \\ &\subseteq \sum_{\Gamma \in CH_{d-j}(Y \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}} \mathrm{Im} (\Gamma_* : H_{i-2j}(Y, \mathbf{Q}) \rightarrow H_{2d-i}(X, \mathbf{Q})). \\ &\subseteq \tilde{N}^{d-i+j} H_{2d-i}(X, \mathbf{Q}), \end{aligned}$$

where the unions run over all smooth projective varieties Y of dimension $\leq i - 2j$ and all correspondences $\Gamma \in CH_{i-j}(Y \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ (resp. $\Gamma \in CH_{d-j}(Y \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$). Now, because L_*^{d-i} is invertible as a correspondence, the reverse inclusion holds, hence the equality on the graded pieces. Now, by lemmas 1.2 and 3.3, the form Q_i restricted to $\mathrm{Gr}_{\tilde{N}}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$ is non degenerate. To conclude it remains to say that the form Q_i is given on $H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$ by $Q_i(\alpha, \beta) := \langle \alpha, L_*^{i-d} \beta \rangle$ where $\langle, \rangle$ is the Poincaré pairing on $H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}) \times H_{2d-i}(X, \mathbf{Q})$. $\square$

4 On the action of the refined CK projectors $\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}$ on Chow groups

Recall that the numerical motive of a smooth projective variety X over a field k satisfying the Künneth conjecture admits a refined Künneth decomposition $\mathfrak{h}_i^{\mathrm{num}}(X) = \bigoplus_{j=0}^{\lfloor i/2 \rfloor} \mathrm{Gr}_{\tilde{N}}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\mathrm{num}}(X)$

where each motive $\mathrm{Gr}_{\tilde{N}}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\mathrm{num}}(X)$ is isomorphic to a motive of the form $(X, \tilde{\pi}_{i,j}^{\mathrm{num}}, 0)$ for some projector $\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}^{\mathrm{num}} \in \mathcal{Z}_d^{\mathrm{num}}(X \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$. In the case the Chow motive $\mathfrak{h}(X)$ is finite dimensional, these mutually orthogonal projectors lift to mutually orthogonal projectors $\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}$ and we wish to study the action of these projectors on the Chow groups $CH_l(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ of X .

Our method consists of first studying the support of these projectors. We have the following

Definition 4.1. A cycle $\Gamma \in CH_d(X \times X)$ is said to be *supported* on $Y \times Z$ if Y and Z are closed subschemes of X such that Γ is in the image of the map $CH_d(Y \times Z) \rightarrow CH_d(X \times X)$ induced by the closed embedding $Y \times Z \hookrightarrow X \times X$.

Similarly to the previous section, we first treat the case when the field k is arbitrary and consider the coniveau filtration N on the numerical motive of X . We then treat the case $k \subset \mathbf{C}$ and consider the coniveau filtration $\tilde{N}$ on the cohomology of X . In this latter case, we obtain much more as we are able to work at the level of homological equivalence rather than numerical equivalence. The crucial input is the Hodge index theorem. The reader will notice the great similarities of the two approaches.

We conclude with some broad remarks about the conjectural link between the refined CK decomposition of the motive of X and expected BBM filtrations on the Chow groups of X .

4.1 On the support of the refined Künneth projectors : the general case

We work at the level of numerical motives. It is therefore more natural to consider the filtration N since it splits canonically.

Let k be a field and let ℓ be a prime number different from the characteristic of k . Let X be a d -dimensional smooth projective variety over k and assume $B(Y)$ holds for all smooth projective varieties Y over k . The filtration $\tilde{N}$ then coincides with the filtration N on numerical motives (proposition 2.5). As such, the filtration $\tilde{N}$ splits canonically.

By definition of the filtration $\tilde{N}$, there exists a smooth projective scheme Z of pure dimension $i-2j$ and a morphism $\gamma \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{num}}}(\mathfrak{h}^{\mathrm{num}}(Z)(j), \mathfrak{h}_i^{\mathrm{num}}(X))$ such that $\mathrm{Gr}_{\tilde{N}}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\mathrm{num}}(X) = \mathrm{Im}(\gamma : \mathfrak{h}^{\mathrm{num}}(Z)(j) \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_i^{\mathrm{num}}(X))$.

Since the Lefschetz conjecture implies the Künneth conjecture, the formula in the lemma can be improved to $\mathrm{Gr}_{\tilde{N}}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\mathrm{num}}(X) = \mathrm{Im}(\gamma : \mathfrak{h}_{i-2j}^{\mathrm{num}}(Z)(j) \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_i^{\mathrm{num}}(X))$ for weight reasons.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $f : M \rightarrow N$ be any surjective morphism of numerical motives and suppose there exists an isomorphism $\alpha : N \xrightarrow{\cong} N^{\vee}(i)$. Then there exists a morphism $\theta : M^{\vee}(i) \rightarrow M$ such that the composition*

$$N^{\vee}(i) \xrightarrow{f^{\vee}(i)} M^{\vee}(i) \xrightarrow{\theta} M \xrightarrow{f} N$$

is an isomorphism

Proof. Thanks to [3, A.2.13], the morphism f decomposes as the direct sum of an isomorphism and of the zero map. Precisely, f decomposes as

$$f_1 \oplus f_2 : M_1 \oplus M_2 \rightarrow N$$

where $f_1 : M_1 \rightarrow N$ is an isomorphism and $f_2 : M_2 \rightarrow N$ is the zero map. Dualizing f yields $f^\vee(i) = f_1^\vee(i) \oplus f_2^\vee(i) : N^\vee(i) \rightarrow M_1^\vee(i) \oplus M_2^\vee(i)$. Let then θ be the morphism

$$\begin{pmatrix} f_1 \circ \alpha \circ (f_1^\vee(i))^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} : M_1^\vee(i) \oplus M_2^\vee(i) \longrightarrow M_1 \oplus M_2.$$

It is then clear that $f \circ \theta \circ f^\vee(i)$ is an isomorphism. $\square$

Theorem 4.3. *Assume conjecture B. The refined Künneth projector $\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}^{\text{num}}$ is numerically equivalent to a cycle supported on $Y^j \times Z_{i-j}$ with Y^j and Z_{i-j} closed subschemes of X such that $\dim Y^j = d - j$ and $\dim Z_{i-j} = i - j$.*

Proof. Let's mention again that the assumption of conjecture B implies that the filtration $\tilde{N}$ coincides with the filtration N on motives of the form $\mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)$ for all X , see proposition 2.5.

Let Z be a smooth projective scheme of dimension $i - 2j$ and let $\gamma \in CH_{i-j}(Z \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ be a correspondence such that

$$\gamma : \mathfrak{h}_{i-2j}^{\text{num}}(Z)(j) \rightarrow \text{Gr}_{\tilde{N}}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)$$

is surjective. The dual correspondence $\gamma^\vee$ induces an injective morphism

$$\gamma^\vee(j) : (\text{Gr}_{\tilde{N}}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X))^\vee(j) \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{i-2j}^{\text{num}}(Z)^\vee.$$

Write L for the isomorphism

$$L : \text{Gr}_{\tilde{N}}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X) \xrightarrow{\cong} (\text{Gr}_{\tilde{N}}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X))^\vee(i)$$

given by proposition 3.1.

The assumptions of lemma 4.2 are fulfilled, yielding a morphism

$$\theta : \mathfrak{h}_{i-2j}^{\text{num}}(Z)^\vee(i - 2j) \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_{i-2j}^{\text{num}}(Z)(j)$$

such that the composition

$$\varphi : \text{Gr}_{\tilde{N}}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X) \xrightarrow{\cong} (\text{Gr}_{\tilde{N}}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X))^\vee(i) \xrightarrow{\gamma^\vee} \mathfrak{h}_{i-2j}^{\text{num}}(Z)^\vee(i - j) \xrightarrow{\theta} \mathfrak{h}_{i-2j}^{\text{num}}(Z)(j) \xrightarrow{\gamma} \text{Gr}_{\tilde{N}}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)$$

is an isomorphism. Let ψ denote the inverse of φ .

We have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathrm{Gr}_{\tilde{N}}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\mathrm{num}}(X) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}^{\mathrm{num}}} & \mathrm{Gr}_{\tilde{N}}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\mathrm{num}}(X) \\
\searrow \theta \circ \gamma^\vee \circ L & & \nearrow \psi \circ \gamma \\
& \mathfrak{h}_{i-2j}^{\mathrm{num}}(Z)(j) &
\end{array}$$

Therefore $\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}^{\mathrm{num}}$ is numerically equivalent to a correspondence that factors through Z . As such, $\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}^{\mathrm{num}}$ is numerically equivalent to the cycle $\tilde{\Pi}_{i,j} := (L^\vee \circ \gamma \circ \theta^\vee, \psi \circ \gamma)_* \Delta_Z$ where Δ_Z is the diagonal in $Z \times Z$. Let $Y^j := \mathrm{cl}(({}^t L \circ \gamma \circ {}^t \theta)_* Z)$ and $Z_{i-j} := \mathrm{cl}((\psi \circ \gamma)_* Z)$ where cl denotes the closure for the Zariski topology on X . The cycle $\tilde{\Pi}_{i,j}$ is supported on $Y^j \times Z_{i-j}$. It is easy to check that $\dim Y^j = d - j$ and $\dim Z_{i-j} = i - j$. $\square$

4.2 On the support of the refined Künneth projectors : the characteristic zero case.

In this section, we prove theorem 1.

Let k be a subfield of the complex numbers $\mathbf{C}$ and let X be a d -dimensional smooth projective variety over k . The Weil cohomology theory is Betti cohomology. In the case X satisfies the Lefschetz conjecture, homological and numerical equivalence agree on $X \times X$. Therefore the homological motive of X admits a refined Künneth decomposition for the filtration $\tilde{N}$:

$$\mathfrak{h}^{\mathrm{hom}}(X) = \bigoplus_{i,j} (X, \tilde{\pi}_{i,j}^{\mathrm{hom}}, 0)$$

with $\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}^{\mathrm{hom}}$ simply equal to $\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}^{\mathrm{num}}$.

By proposition 3.4, the coniveau filtration $\tilde{N}$ on $H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$ splits canonically. Still assuming $B(X)$, we are going to prove that the projections $H_*(X) \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}_{\tilde{N}}^j H_i(X) \hookrightarrow H_*(X)$ are induced by algebraic correspondences. As a consequence, the projectors $\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}^{\mathrm{hom}}$ are unique (theorem 4.7).

The following lemma as well as its generalization (lemma 4.5) are essential. If H is a rational Hodge structure of weight i and $Q(\alpha, \beta)$ is a bilinear form on H , the associated hermitian form attached to Q is the hermitian form H on $H \otimes_{\mathbf{Q}} \mathbf{C}$ defined by $H(\alpha, \beta) = (\sqrt{-1})^i Q(\alpha, \bar{\beta})$.

Lemma 4.4 (lemma 5 in [43]). *Let H and H' be rational Hodge structures endowed respectively with polarizations Q and Q' . Let $\gamma : H \rightarrow H'$ be a morphism of Hodge structures. Then*

$$\mathrm{Im}(\gamma) = \mathrm{Im}(\gamma \circ {}^t \gamma),$$

where H is identified with its dual $H^\vee$ via the polarization Q it carries.

Proof. By linear algebra, we have $\dim_{\mathbf{Q}} H = \dim_{\mathbf{Q}} \operatorname{Ker} \gamma + \dim_{\mathbf{Q}} \operatorname{Im} {}^t\gamma$. Therefore, it is enough to prove that the subspace $\operatorname{Ker} \gamma \cap \operatorname{Im} {}^t\gamma$ is zero. The subspace $\operatorname{Ker} \gamma \cap \operatorname{Im} {}^t\gamma$ actually defines a subHodge structure of H and we claim that the pairing Q restricts to zero on this subspace. Indeed, let z and ${}^t\gamma y$ be elements in $\operatorname{Ker} \gamma \cap \operatorname{Im} {}^t\gamma$. Then we have

$$Q({}^t\gamma y, z) = Q'(y, \gamma z) = Q'(y, 0) = 0.$$

By lemma 1.1, $\operatorname{Ker} \gamma \cap \operatorname{Im} {}^t\gamma = \{0\}$ □

Lemma 4.5. *Let H and H' be Hodge structures endowed respectively with bilinear forms Q and Q' . Assume that H and H' split into orthogonal direct sums of rational Hodge structures with respect to the forms Q and Q' :*

$$H' = H'_1 \oplus \dots \oplus H'_k \quad \text{and} \quad H = H_1 \oplus \dots \oplus H_l.$$

Assume that for all i , either Q_{H_i} or $-Q_{H_i}$ (resp. either $Q'_{H'_i}$ or $-Q'_{H'_i}$) defines a polarization on the Hodge structure H_i (resp. H'_i). Denote by $p_r : H \rightarrow H$ the orthogonal projector on H_r and $q_s : H' \rightarrow H'$ the orthogonal projector on H'_s . Let $\gamma : H' \rightarrow H$ be a morphism of Hodge structures such that $(p_r)_ \operatorname{Im} \gamma \subset \operatorname{Im} \gamma$ for all r . Then*

$$\operatorname{Im} (\gamma) = \operatorname{Im} (\gamma \circ {}^t\gamma).$$

Proof. Since $(p_r)_* \operatorname{Im} \gamma \subset \operatorname{Im} \gamma$ for all r , we have $\operatorname{Im} \gamma = \bigoplus_r (p_r)_* \operatorname{Im} \gamma = \bigoplus_r \operatorname{Im} (p_r \circ \gamma)$. It is thus enough to show the statement for $p_r \circ \gamma$. In other words, we can and we will assume that the Hodge structure H is polarized. Let's then write $\gamma = \sum_s \gamma \circ q_s$. Up to sign, the map $\gamma \circ q_s : H'_s \rightarrow H$ is then a morphism of Hodge structures which are polarized. By lemma 4.4 it satisfies $\operatorname{Im} (\gamma \circ q_s \circ {}^t(\gamma \circ q_s)) = \operatorname{Im} (\gamma \circ q_s)$. Because the projectors q_s are self-adjoint and mutually orthogonal, we have that $\gamma \circ q_t \circ {}^t(\gamma \circ q_s) = \gamma \circ q_t \circ {}^t q_s \circ {}^t\gamma = 0$ if $s \neq t$. Therefore,

$$\operatorname{Im} (\gamma \circ {}^t\gamma) = \operatorname{Im} \left(\sum_{s,t} \gamma \circ q_t \circ {}^t(\gamma \circ q_s) \right) = \operatorname{Im} \left(\sum_s \gamma \circ q_s \right) = \operatorname{Im} (\gamma).$$

□

Theorem 4.6. *Assume $B(X)$. Then, the projector $H_*(X) \twoheadrightarrow \tilde{N}^j H_i(X) \hookrightarrow H_*(X)$ is induced by an algebraic cycle $\tilde{\Sigma}_{i,j} \in \mathcal{Z}_d^{\operatorname{hom}}(X \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$. Moreover $\tilde{\Sigma}_{i,j} \in \operatorname{End}(\mathfrak{h}^{\operatorname{hom}}(X))$ factors through $\mathfrak{h}^{\operatorname{hom}}(Z)(j)$ for some smooth projective scheme Z of dimension at most $i - 2j$.*

Proof. By definition of the coniveau filtration $\tilde{N}$, let Z be a smooth projective scheme of pure dimension $i - 2j$ and let $\gamma \in CH_{i-j}(Z \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ be a correspondence such that

$$\tilde{N}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}) \subseteq \operatorname{Im} (\gamma_* : H_*(Z, \mathbf{Q}) \rightarrow H_*(X, \mathbf{Q})).$$

Since we are assuming $B(X)$, X satisfies the Künneth conjecture. Let $\pi_i \in \mathcal{Z}_d^{\text{hom}}(X \times X)$ denote the projector whose homology class is $H_*(X) \rightarrow H_i(X) \hookrightarrow H_*(X)$. Then, by considering $\pi_i \circ \gamma$ instead of γ , we can even assume that

$$\tilde{N}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}) = \text{Im}(\gamma_* : H_*(Z, \mathbf{Q}) \rightarrow H_*(X, \mathbf{Q})).$$

Moreover, for weight reasons, γ acts as zero on $H_k(Z, \mathbf{Q})$ for $k \neq i - 2j$. The dual correspondence ${}^t\gamma$ then induces a morphism

$$({}^t\gamma)_* : H_*(X, \mathbf{Q})^\vee \rightarrow H_{i-2j}(Z, \mathbf{Q})^\vee \hookrightarrow H_*(Z, \mathbf{Q})^\vee$$

which is injective when restricted to $(\tilde{N}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}))^\vee$. Since Z has dimension $i - 2j$, $H_{i-2j}(Z, \mathbf{Q})$ identifies with its dual $H_{i-2j}(Z, \mathbf{Q})^\vee$ via the Poincaré pairing.

Write L for the Lefschetz isomorphism

$$L : H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}) \xrightarrow{\simeq} H_{2d-i}(X, \mathbf{Q})$$

which is assumed to be induced by an algebraic correspondence. Let Q be the bilinear form $\langle -, L_*^{i-d} - \rangle$ induced by L on $H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$. By proposition 3.5, L restricts to an isomorphism

$$L : \tilde{N}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}) \xrightarrow{\simeq} \tilde{N}^{d-i+j} H_{2d-i}(X, \mathbf{Q})$$

and there is an identification

$$\tilde{N}^{d-i+j} H_{2d-i}(X, \mathbf{Q}) = (\tilde{N}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}))^\vee.$$

Combining those, we get a correspondence $\Gamma = \gamma \circ {}^t\gamma \circ L \in CH_d(X \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ which induces a morphism $\varphi : H_*(X, \mathbf{Q}) \rightarrow H_*(X, \mathbf{Q})$ of rational Hodge structures which breaks up as follows when restricted to $\tilde{N}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$:

$$\varphi|_{\tilde{N}^j H_i(X)} : \tilde{N}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}) \xrightarrow{\simeq} \tilde{N}^{d-i+j} H_{2d-i}(X, \mathbf{Q}) \xrightarrow{{}^t\gamma_*} H_{i-2j}(Z, \mathbf{Q}) \xrightarrow{\gamma_*} \tilde{N}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}).$$

If H denotes the orthogonal complement of $\tilde{N}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$ in $H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$ for the bilinear form Q induced by L , then clearly $\varphi|_H = 0$. Moreover, by lemma 3.3 the Hodge structure $\tilde{N}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$ fulfills the assumptions of lemma 4.5. Therefore, we have $\text{Im}(\gamma_*) = \text{Im}(\gamma_* \circ {}^t\gamma_*)$. Hence, φ induces an isomorphism of the finite dimensional $\mathbf{Q}$ -vector space $\tilde{N}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$. By the theorem of Cayley-Hamilton, there exists a polynomial $P \in \mathbf{Q}[X]$ such that $(\varphi|_{\tilde{N}^j H_i(X)})^{-1} = P(\varphi|_{\tilde{N}^j H_i(X)})$. Let then Γ' be the correspondence $P(\Gamma)$. The composition $\Gamma'_* \circ \gamma_* \circ {}^t\gamma_* \circ L$ thus induces the identity on the rational Hodge structure $\tilde{N}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$ and is zero on its orthogonal complement H .

In other words, we have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
H_*(X, \mathbf{Q}) & \longrightarrow & \tilde{N}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}) & \xlongequal{\quad} & \tilde{N}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}) & \hookrightarrow & H_*(X, \mathbf{Q}) \\
& \searrow^{t\gamma_* \circ L} & \downarrow & & \uparrow & \nearrow^{\Gamma'_* \circ \gamma_*} & \\
& & H_{i-2j}(Z, \mathbf{Q})^\vee & \xlongequal{\quad} & H_{i-2j}(Z, \mathbf{Q}) & &
\end{array}$$

Therefore the correspondence $\tilde{\Sigma}_{i,j} := \Gamma' \circ \gamma \circ t\gamma \circ L$ has homology class the projector $H_*(X, \mathbf{Q}) \twoheadrightarrow \tilde{N}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}) \hookrightarrow H_*(X, \mathbf{Q})$ and factors through Z . $\square$

We now define

$$\tilde{\Pi}_{i,j}^{\text{hom}} := \tilde{\Sigma}_{i,j} - \tilde{\Sigma}_{i,j+1}.$$

The correspondence $\tilde{\Sigma}_{i,j}$ acts on homology as the projector on $\tilde{N}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$ and $\tilde{\Sigma}_{i,j+1}$ acts on homology as the projector on $\tilde{N}^{j+1} H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}) \subseteq \tilde{N}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$. If H denotes the orthogonal complement of $\tilde{N}^{j+1} H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$ inside $\tilde{N}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$ for the form Q , then H is isomorphic to $\text{Gr}_{\tilde{N}}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$ (recall that the filtration splits with respect to Q by proposition 3.4). Since correspondences respect the polarization, the correspondence $\tilde{\Pi}_{i,j}^{\text{hom}}$ induces the projection $H_*(X, \mathbf{Q}) \twoheadrightarrow \text{Gr}_{\tilde{N}}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}) \hookrightarrow H_*(X, \mathbf{Q})$.

Recall that $\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}^{\text{hom}}$ is a projector in $\text{End}_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{hom}}}(X) = \text{End}_{\mathcal{M}_{\text{num}}}(X)$ such that $(X, \tilde{\pi}_{i,j}^{\text{hom}}, 0) = \text{Gr}_{\tilde{N}}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)$.

Theorem 4.7. *Assume $B(X)$. Then $(X, \tilde{\Pi}_{i,j}^{\text{hom}}, 0) = (X, \tilde{\pi}_{i,j}^{\text{hom}}, 0)$ for all i and j . Moreover,*

$$\tilde{N}^j H_i(X) = H_*(\tilde{N}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)).$$

Proof. Recall that in characteristic zero $B(X)$ implies $D(X \times X)$. By proposition 2.9, we already have $\tilde{N}^j H_i(X) \supseteq H_*(\tilde{N}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X))$. The previous theorem shows that $(\tilde{\Sigma}_{i,j})_* H_*(X) = \tilde{N}^j H_i(X)$ and that $\tilde{\Sigma}_{i,j}$ factors through $\mathfrak{h}^{\text{hom}}(Z)$ for some smooth projective scheme Z of pure dimension $i - 2j$. Therefore, $\text{Im}(\tilde{\Sigma}_{i,j}^{\text{num}} : \mathfrak{h}^{\text{num}}(X) \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}^{\text{num}}(X))$ is a summand of $\tilde{N}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)$. Applying the Betti cohomology realization functor gives $\tilde{N}^j H_i(X) \subseteq H_*(\tilde{N}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X))$. This proves $\tilde{N}^j H_i(X) = H_*(\tilde{N}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X))$. Consequently, since H_* is faithful, $(X, \tilde{\Sigma}_{i,j}, 0)$ is equal to the homological motive $(X, \sum_{k=j}^{\lfloor i/2 \rfloor} \tilde{\pi}_{i,k}^{\text{hom}}, 0)$ for all i and j . Thus, we get the desired equality of motives $(X, \tilde{\Pi}_{i,j}^{\text{hom}}, 0) = (X, \tilde{\pi}_{i,j}^{\text{hom}}, 0)$. $\square$

Theorem 4.8. *Assume $B(X)$, then the refined Künneth projector $\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}^{\text{hom}}$ is homologically equivalent to a cycle supported on $Y^j \times Z_{i-j}$ with Y^j and Z_{i-j} closed subschemes of X such that $\dim Y^j = d - j$ and $\dim Z_{i-j} = i - j$.*

Proof. By theorems 4.6 and 4.7, the projector $\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}^{\text{hom}} : \mathfrak{h}^{\text{hom}}(X) \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}^{\text{hom}}(X)$ factors through $\mathfrak{h}^{\text{hom}}(Z)(j)$ for some smooth projective scheme Z of pure dimension $i - 2j$. Let's write

$$\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}^{\text{hom}} : \mathfrak{h}^{\text{hom}}(X) \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathfrak{h}^{\text{hom}}(Z)(j) \xrightarrow{\beta} \mathfrak{h}^{\text{hom}}(X).$$

Let Δ_Z be the class of the diagonal in $\mathcal{Z}_{i-2j}^{\text{hom}}(Z \times Z)$. Then, $\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}^{\text{hom}} = ({}^t\alpha, \beta)_* \Delta_Z$.

Let then $Y^j := \text{cl}(({}^t\alpha)_* Z)$ and $Z_{i-j} := \text{cl}(\beta_* Z)$ where cl denotes the closure for the Zariski topology on X . The cycle $\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}^{\text{hom}}$ is thus supported on $Y^j \times Z_{i-j}$. It is easy to check that $\dim Y^j = d - j$ and $\dim Z_{i-j} = i - j$. $\square$

The following proposition will be used in section 5.

Proposition 4.9. *Let X be a smooth projective variety whose Chow motive is finite dimensional. Assume $B(X)$. If $\text{Gr}_{\tilde{N}}^j H_i(X) = 0$ for some integers i and j , then the Chow motive $(X, \tilde{\pi}_{i,j}, 0)$ is zero.*

Proof. By theorem 4.7, we have $\tilde{N}^k H_i(X) = H_*(\tilde{N}^k \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X))$ for all k . Taking $k = j$ and $k = j + 1$ gives $H_*(\tilde{N}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)) = H_*(\tilde{N}^{j+1} \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X))$. Since $\tilde{N}^{j+1} \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)$ is a direct summand of $\tilde{N}^j \mathfrak{h}_i^{\text{num}}(X)$, we get that they are equal by faithfulness of the functor H_* . Now, by lemma 1.9.1, this implies $(X, \tilde{\pi}_{i,j}, 0) = 0$ for any choice of a lift $\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}$. $\square$

4.3 Main result

Let X be a smooth projective variety over k whose Chow motive is finite-dimensional. In this section either of the following holds

- k is a subfield of $\mathbf{C}$ and we assume $B(X)$ holds, e.g. any abelian variety X over k .
- k is any field and we assume the Lefschetz conjecture B for all smooth projective varieties.

Under our assumptions, $\mathfrak{h}^{\text{num}}(X)$ admits a *unique* refined Künneth decomposition for the filtration $\tilde{N}$ which lifts to a refined Chow-Künneth decomposition

$$\mathfrak{h}(X) = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{2d} \bigoplus_{j=0}^{\lfloor i/2 \rfloor} (X, \tilde{\pi}_{i,j}, 0)$$

which we fix once and for all (it is unique up to isomorphism).

Theorem 4.10. *The refined Chow-Künneth projector $\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}$ acts as 0 on $CH_l(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ in the following cases :*

- $l < j$
- $l > i - j$
- $l = i - j$ and $i < 2l$.

Proof. By theorems 4.3 and 4.8, the projector $\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}$ is numerically equivalent to a correspondence $\tilde{\Pi}_{i,j}$ supported on $Y^j \times Z_{i-j}$. This correspondence $\tilde{\Pi}_{i,j}$ acts as 0 on $CH_l(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ for $l < j$ or $l > i - j$ for dimension reasons, that is $\text{Ker } \tilde{\Pi}_{i,j} = CH_l(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$. Clearly, $CH_l(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ is stabilized by the action of any correspondence in $CH_d(X \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$. Therefore lemma 1.13 applies, giving $\text{Ker } \tilde{\pi}_{i,j} \supseteq \text{Ker } \tilde{\Pi}_{i,j} = CH_l(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ for $l < j$ or $l > i - j$.

In the remaining case ($l = i - j$ and $i < 2l$), $\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}$ is numerically equivalent to a cycle $\tilde{\Pi}_{i,j}$ which is supported on $X \times Z$ with $\dim Z = l$. Decompose Z as the sum of its irreducible components $Z = \sum Z_{\alpha}$ and decompose $\tilde{\Pi}_{i,j}$ accordingly, i.e. $\tilde{\Pi}_{i,j} = \sum \Pi_{\alpha}$ with Π_{α} supported on $X \times Z_{\alpha}$. Then, if $c \in CH_l(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$, we have the formula

$$(\tilde{\Pi}_{i,j})_* c = \sum \deg((p_1)_* \Pi_{\alpha} \cap c) Z_{\alpha},$$

where p_1 is the projection $X \times X \rightarrow X$ on the first factor.

Moreover, $\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}^{\text{num}}$ acts trivially on $\mathcal{Z}_l^{\text{num}}(X)$. Therefore, $\tilde{\Pi}_{i,j}$ sends $CH_l(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ to $CH_l(X)_{\text{num}, \mathbf{Q}}$. Let c be a numerically trivial l -cycle. Then by the above formula $(\tilde{\Pi}_{i,j})_* c = 0$. Hence, $\tilde{\Pi}_{i,j} \circ \tilde{\Pi}_{i,j}$ acts as zero on $CH_l(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$. Besides, $\tilde{\Pi}_{i,j} \circ \tilde{\Pi}_{i,j}$ is numerically equivalent to $\tilde{\pi}_{i,j} \circ \tilde{\pi}_{i,j} = \tilde{\pi}_{i,j}$. By lemma 1.13, we get $\text{Ker } \tilde{\pi}_{i,j} \supseteq \text{Ker } (\tilde{\Pi}_{i,j} \circ \tilde{\Pi}_{i,j}) = CH_l(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$. $\square$

Let X be a complex smooth projective variety such that $B(X)$ holds and $\mathfrak{h}(X)$ is finite dimensional. The diagram below represents which graded pieces for the coniveau filtration $\tilde{N}$ of the rational singular cohomology of X don't induce a "motivic" action on $CH_l(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$. A star with coordinates (i, j) ($0 \leq j \leq i$) indicates that $\text{Gr}_{\tilde{N}}^j H_{i+j}(X, \mathbf{Q})$ does not induce a "motivic" action on $CH_l(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$.

	0	1		l						d
0	*	*	*	*	*					
1	*	*	*	*	*					
	*	*	*	*	*					
	*	*	*	*	*					
	*	*	*	*	*					
l	*	*	*	*	*					
						*	*	*	*	*
						*	*	*	*	*
						*	*	*	*	*
						*	*	*	*	*
						*	*	*	*	*
						*	*	*	*	*
d						*	*	*	*	*

If moreover the generalized Hodge conjecture holds, then a star with coordinates (i, j) indicates that the graded piece $\mathrm{Gr}_{N_H}^j H_{i+j}(X, \mathbf{Q})$ of the cohomology of X does not “control” the rational Chow group $CH_l(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$. As a partial converse, the result of Lewis and Schoen mentioned earlier shows that if $\mathrm{Gr}_{N_H}^l H_{2l+j}(X, \mathbf{Q}) \neq 0$ then $CH_l(X)_{\mathrm{alg}, \mathbf{Q}}$ is not representable if $j > 1$.

Remark 4.11. As a consequence of theorem 4.10, we see that for X a smooth projective variety over a subfield of $\mathbf{C}$, if $B(X)$ holds and $\mathfrak{h}(X)$ is finite dimensional then $\tilde{\pi}_{2l,l}$ and $\tilde{\pi}_{2l+1,l}$ act only on $CH_l(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$, that is $CH_*(X, \tilde{\pi}_{2l,l}, 0)_{\mathbf{Q}} = CH_l(X, \tilde{\pi}_{2l,l}, 0)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ and $CH_*(X, \tilde{\pi}_{2l+1,l}, 0)_{\mathbf{Q}} = CH_l(X, \tilde{\pi}_{2l+1,l}, 0)_{\mathbf{Q}}$.

Remark 4.12. In [15] (Remark 5.9(a)), Jannsen asks if the CK projectors π_i can be chosen to be supported on $X \times W$ with W a subvariety of X of dimension i (this question was also raised by Murre [30]). This question was answered under the assumption of $B(X)$ and finite dimensionality for $\mathfrak{h}(X)$ in theorem 7.7.4 of [19]. Here, we do not prove that X admits a refined Chow-Künneth decomposition $\{\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}\}$ with each $\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}$ supported on $Y \times Z$ for some subvarieties Y and Z with $\dim Y = d - j$ and $\dim Z = i - j$. Rather, we prove under $B(X)$ and finite dimensionality for $\mathfrak{h}(X)$ that each $\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}$ is homologous to a correspondence $\tilde{\Pi}_{i,j}$ which is supported on $Y \times Z$ for some subvarieties Y and Z with $\dim Y = d - j$ and $\dim Z = i - j$.

Corollary 4.13. *The Chow-Künneth projector π_i acts as 0 on $CH_0(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ if $i > d$. If $l \neq 0$, π_i acts as 0 on $CH_l(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ if either $i > d + l$, or $i \leq l$. Thus, in characteristic zero, one part of Murre’s vanishing conjecture for X follows from the Lefschetz conjecture for X and finite dimensionality for X .*

Proof. This is because $\pi_i = \tilde{\pi}_{i,0} \oplus \dots \oplus \tilde{\pi}_{i, \lfloor i/2 \rfloor}$ and each $\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}$ acts as zero on $CH_l(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ under the assumptions of the corollary. $\square$

Remark 4.14. The above corollary is not optimal in positive characteristic. Indeed, Kahn, Murre and Pedrini showed [19, 7.7.4] that under the assumption of $B(X)$ and finite dimensionality for $\mathfrak{h}(X)$, the CK projector π_i factors through the motive of a smooth linear section of X of dimension $\min(i, 2d - i)$. This is actually enough to deduce corollary 4.13.

Remark 4.15. Beauville [4] proves corollary 4.13 for complex abelian varieties using the Fourier-Mukai transform. Since we know that abelian varieties satisfy the Lefschetz conjecture and are finite dimensional in the sense of Kimura, we get another proof of Beauville’s result. This result extends to abelian varieties defined over any field thanks to the previous remark.

Remark 4.16. In order to get that the full Murre vanishing conjecture for X is a consequence of the conjunction of Kimura’s conjecture and the Lefschetz conjecture for X , it remains to prove that the refined CK projectors $\tilde{\pi}_{i,j}$ act trivially on $CH_l(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ for $i < 2l$ and $i - j \geq l$. Notice that this is not a problem for $l = 0$.

4.4 Proof of 4. and 5. in theorem 2

The base field k is an algebraically closed subfield of $\mathbf{C}$. In [39, Th. 1 and Th. 2], we proved the following (together with proposition 3.5)

Theorem 4.17. *Let X be a smooth projective variety of dimension d over k . Assume $B(X)$. Then there exists a set of mutually orthogonal Chow projectors $\tilde{\Pi}_{i, [i/2]} \in CH_d(X \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ ($0 \leq i \leq 2d$) whose homology classes are the projectors $H_*(X, \mathbf{Q}) \rightarrow \tilde{N}^{[i/2]} H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}) \hookrightarrow H_*(X, \mathbf{Q})$. Moreover, we have for all i*

$$CH_i(X)_{\text{hom}, \mathbf{Q}} = \text{Ker} (\tilde{\Pi}_{2i, i} : CH_i(X)_{\mathbf{Q}} \rightarrow CH_i(X)_{\mathbf{Q}})$$

and

$$\text{Ker} (AJ_i : CH_i(X)_{\text{alg}, \mathbf{Q}} \rightarrow J_i^a(X) \otimes \mathbf{Q}) = \text{Ker} (\tilde{\Pi}_{2i+1, i} : CH_i(X)_{\text{alg}, \mathbf{Q}} \rightarrow CH_i(X)_{\text{alg}, \mathbf{Q}}).$$

The finite dimensionality assumption for $\mathfrak{h}(X)$ allows to prove that the above kernels do not depend on the choice of a lift $\tilde{\pi}_{i, [i/2]}$ for the projector $\tilde{\pi}_{i, [i/2]}^{\text{hom}}$.

Proposition 4.18. *Let X be a smooth projective variety over k whose Chow motive is finite dimensional. Then, if $B(X)$ holds, we have*

$$CH_i(X)_{\text{hom}, \mathbf{Q}} = \text{Ker} (\tilde{\pi}_{2i, i} : CH_i(X)_{\mathbf{Q}} \rightarrow CH_i(X)_{\mathbf{Q}})$$

for any choice of projector $\tilde{\pi}_{2i, i}$ such that $(\tilde{\pi}_{2i, i})_* H_{2i}(X) = \tilde{N}^i H_{2i}(X)$.

Proof. By theorem 4.17, $CH_i(X)_{\text{hom}, \mathbf{Q}} = \text{Ker} (\Pi_{2i, i} : CH_i(X)_{\mathbf{Q}} \rightarrow CH_i(X)_{\mathbf{Q}})$. The group $CH_i(X)_{\text{hom}, \mathbf{Q}}$ is stabilized by the action of correspondences in $CH_d(X \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$. Therefore, by lemma 1.14, $\text{Ker} (\pi_{2i, i}) = \text{Ker} (\Pi_{2i, i})$, where both projectors act on $CH_i(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$. $\square$

Remark 4.19. Murre proved that $\text{Ker} (\pi_{2i}) \subseteq CH_i(X)_{\text{num}, \mathbf{Q}}$ in [29] and conjectures that there should be equality, cf. part (D) of conjecture 1.12. By the above corollary, the reverse inclusion amounts then to proving that the projectors $\tilde{\pi}_{2i, j}$ act as zero on $CH_i(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ for $j \neq i$.

Proposition 4.20. *Let X be a smooth projective variety over k whose Chow motive is finite dimensional. Assume the pairing $N^{d-i-1} H_{2d-2i-1}(X, \mathbf{Q}) \times N^i H_{2i+1}(X, \mathbf{Q}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}$ is non degenerate. Then,*

$$\text{Ker} (AJ_i : CH_i(X)_{\text{alg}, \mathbf{Q}} \rightarrow J_i^a(X) \otimes \mathbf{Q}) = \text{Ker} (\pi_{2i+1, i} : CH_i(X)_{\text{alg}, \mathbf{Q}} \rightarrow CH_i(X)_{\text{alg}, \mathbf{Q}})$$

where $\pi_{2i+1, i}$ is any projector in $CH_d(X \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ such that $[\pi_{2i+1, i}]_* H_*(X) = N^i H_{2i+1}(X)$.

Proof. The projectors $\pi_{2i+1, i}$ and $\Pi_{2i+1, i}$ are homologous projectors. By lemma 1.14, it is thus enough to see that $\text{Ker} (AJ_i : CH_i(X)_{\text{alg}, \mathbf{Q}} \rightarrow J_i^a(X) \otimes \mathbf{Q}) = \text{Ker} (\Pi_{2i+1, i})$ is stabilized by the action of correspondences in $CH_d(X \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$. This is indeed the case by functoriality of the algebraic Abel-Jacobi map with respect to the action of correspondences. $\square$

4.5 A few remarks

Assume $k = \mathbf{C}$ for convenience and let X be a smooth projective complex variety such that $B(X)$ holds and whose Chow motive is finite dimensional.

The structure of codimension one cycles is well-understood. Indeed, we have the isomorphism $CH^1(X) \simeq \text{Pic}(X)$. The group $\text{Pic}(X)$ decomposes as the product of the Neron-Severi group $\text{NS}^1(X)$ of X and of the Picard variety attached to X :

$$\text{Pic}(X) \simeq \text{NS}^1(X) \times \text{Pic}^0(X).$$

This decomposition reflects the decomposition

$$CH^1(X) = (\pi_{2d-2,d-1} + \pi_{2d-1,d-1})_* CH^1(X).$$

The fact that we have a complete description of $CH^1(X)$ immediately tells us that the refined Chow-Künneth projectors $\pi_{i,j}$ – if they exist – act as zero on $CH^1(X)$ if either $i < 2d - 2$, or $i = 2d - 2$ and $j = d - 2$. In particular, Murre’s conjecture holds for codimension 1 cycles.

Is it possible to prove that if $\mathfrak{h}(X)$ is finite dimensional and $B(X)$ holds then X satisfies Murre’s conjecture 1.12? It is proved (see e.g lemma 1.9) that under such assumptions condition (A) holds. By remark 1.15, condition (C) boils down to proving that each step of the filtration defines an equivalence relations on cycles for any choice of CK projectors. Concerning the vanishing conjectures, we proved that the Chow-Künneth projectors π_i act trivially on $CH_l(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ for $i > \dim X + l$ and for $i \leq l$. Therefore, in order to get fully condition (B) it remains to prove that π_i acts trivially on $CH_l(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ for $l < i < 2l$. However, most importantly, we do not get condition (D) as a consequence of $B(X)$ and finite dimensionality for $\mathfrak{h}(X)$. Indeed, this would require to prove that the projectors $\tilde{\pi}_{2l,j}$ act trivially on $CH_l(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ for $j < l$ (see remark 4.19). To my knowledge, the only general case when we are able to prove this is for codimension one cycles. Unfortunately, I am not aware of any direct proof and we are only able to prove it because we have an explicit description of the Chow group of codimension one cycles.

So, in weight $2l$, conjecturally the only refined CK projector acting non-trivially on $CH_l(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ is $\pi_{2l,l}$. Can we expect likewise that the only refined CK projectors in weight $2l + 1$ acting non trivially on $CH_l(X)_{\text{hom}, \mathbf{Q}}$ are those $\tilde{\pi}_{2l+1,j}$ for j large enough, i.e. close to l ? In other words, is it only the groups $\text{Gr}_N^j H_{2l+1}(X, \mathbf{Q})$ for j close to l that “control” $CH_l(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$? The answer cannot be affirmative in general. Indeed, Griffiths showed that for a general quintic hypersurface $X \subset \mathbf{P}^4$ the Abel-Jacobi map $AJ_1 : CH_1(X)_{\mathbf{Q}} \rightarrow J_1(X) \otimes \mathbf{Q}$ has non trivial image even though $J_1^{\text{alg}}(X) = 0$.

Moreover, Nori [31] introduced the following increasing filtration on $CH_l(X)_{\text{hom}}$:

$$CH_l(X)_{\text{alg}} = A_0 CH_l(X) \subseteq A_1 CH_l(X) \subseteq \dots \subseteq A_l CH_l(X) = CH_l(X)_{\text{hom}}$$

where $A_r CH_l(X)$ is defined to be the subgroup of $CH_l(X)$ generated by cycles of the form $\Gamma_* z$, where Γ is any correspondence in $CH^{d-l+r}(Y \times X)$ for any smooth projective Y and z is any cycle in $CH_r(Y)_{\text{hom}}$. If $J_l^r(X)$ denotes the r^{th} graded part under the Hodge coniveau filtration of the intermediate Jacobian $J_l(X)$, Nori showed that a cycle ξ in $A_r CH_l(X)$ is mapped into $J_l^{l-r}(X)$ via the Abel-Jacobi map. As such, the Abel-Jacobi map $AJ_l : CH_l(X)_{\text{hom}} \rightarrow J_l(X)$ induces a homomorphism $\text{Gr}_r^A CH_l(X) \rightarrow J_l^{l-r}(X)$. For any l , Nori [31, Theorem 1] then constructed examples of varieties for which there are non-zero cycles in the Griffiths group $\text{Griff}_l(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ that map to zero in $J_l(X)/J_l^l(X)$. This means heuristically that the information carried by $\text{Gr}_{N_H}^j H_{2l+1}(X, \mathbf{Q})$ for any $\min(0, 2l+1-d) \leq j \leq l$ is not sufficient to determine $CH_l(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$.

A few words about what is expected for codimension two cycles. In this case, it is known thanks to Merkurjev-Suslin [27] that $\text{Griff}^2(X)_{\text{tors}}$ injects into the intermediate Jacobian via the Abel-Jacobi map. Nori conjectured that the whole group $\text{Griff}^2(X)$ should inject in the Jacobian, in which case $(\tilde{\pi}_{2d-2, d-2})_* CH^2(X) \subset CH^2(X)_{\text{alg}}$ which is compatible with a result of Jannsen [16] who proves it under the assumptions of the BBM conjectures and $B(X)$.

As a generalization of the above conjectures, we are led to ask if Nori's filtration is linked to the coniveau filtration.

Questions. Do we have

$$CH_l(X)_{\text{alg}, \mathbf{Q}} = (\tilde{\pi}_{2l+1, l} + \tilde{\pi}_{2l+2, l} + \dots + \tilde{\pi}_{d+l, l})_* CH_l(X)_{\mathbf{Q}} ?$$

In other words is $CH_l(X)_{\text{alg}, \mathbf{Q}}$ controlled by $\text{Gr}_{N_H}^l H_{2l+j}(X)$ (for all $j \geq 0$) only ? More generally, do we have

$$\text{Gr}_r^A CH_l(X)_{\text{hom}, \mathbf{Q}} = (\tilde{\pi}_{2l+1, l-r} + \tilde{\pi}_{2l+2, l-r} + \dots + \tilde{\pi}_{d+l-r, l-r})_* CH_l(X)_{\mathbf{Q}} ?$$

In particular, if $k = \min(0, 2l+1-d)$, is the map

$$\text{Gr}_l^A CH_l(X)_{\text{hom}, \mathbf{Q}} \rightarrow J_l^k(X)$$

injective?

5 Some applications

In this section, we fix once and for all a smooth projective variety of dimension d over an algebraically closed subfield k of $\mathbf{C}$ whose Chow motive $\mathfrak{h}(X)$ is finite dimensional (we write $\text{FD}(X)$) and for which the Lefschetz conjecture $B(X)$ holds.

Moreover, in order to avoid unwieldy statements we set the following

Definition 5.1. The coniveau number $g_{i,j}(X)$ of X is equal to $\dim_{\mathbf{Q}} \text{Gr}_{N_H}^j H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$.

In particular, fixing i , if the coniveau numbers $g_{i,j}(X)$ vanish for $j = 0$ up to $k - 1$ then $H_i(X) = \tilde{N}^k H_i(X)$. Because $\tilde{N} \subseteq N$, the cohomology group $H_i(X)$ is then supported in dimension $i - k$. Consequently, because $N \subset N_H$, the Hodge numbers $h_{0,i}(X), \dots, h_{i-k,k}(X)$ vanish. If the generalized Hodge conjecture holds for all varieties then this last condition on the Hodge numbers is equivalent to $H_i(X) = \tilde{N}^k H_i(X)$.

5.1 Finite dimensionality and support of the Chow groups

0-cycles. Roitman [33] first proved that given a smooth projective complex variety X , if $CH_0(X)_{\text{hom}}$ is representable then $H^0(X, \Omega_X^q) = 0$ for all $q > 1$. This was generalized by Bloch and Srinivas [6] who proved, using a decomposition of the diagonal, that if $CH_0(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ is supported in dimension i (i.e. there exists a closed subscheme Z of X of dimension i such that the map $CH_0(Z)_{\mathbf{Q}} \rightarrow CH_0(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ induced by the inclusion of Z inside X is surjective), then $H^0(X, \Omega_X^q) = 0$ for all $q > i$. We give here a conditional converse statement. This gives a proof of conjecture 3.3 of [15] under $B(X)$ and finite dimensionality for X , which is a slight improvement since Jannsen proves it under the validity of the standard conjectures and the BBM conjectures (these two conjectures imply Kimura's conjecture by [3]).

Proposition 5.2. *Assume $B(X)$ and $FD(X)$. If the coniveau numbers $g_{i+1,0}, g_{i+2,0}, \dots, g_{d,0}$ of X vanish (i.e. if $H_k(X) = \tilde{N}^1 H_k(X)$ for all $k > i$), then $CH_0(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ is supported in dimension i .*

Proof. By proposition 4.9 and theorem 4.10,

$$(\Delta_X)_* CH_0(X)_{\mathbf{Q}} = (\tilde{\pi}_{0,0} + \tilde{\pi}_{1,0} + \dots + \tilde{\pi}_{i,0})_* CH_0(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}.$$

By theorem 1, each projector $\tilde{\pi}_{k,0}$ is equal to $\tilde{\Pi}_{k,0} + c_{k,0}$ for some correspondences $\tilde{\Pi}_{k,0}$ and $c_{k,0}$ in $CH_d(X \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ such that $\tilde{\Pi}_{k,0}$ is supported on $X \times Z$ for some closed subscheme Z of X of dimension at most k and such that $c_{k,0}$ is homologically trivial. Using the fact that the correspondence $\Delta_X \in CH_d(X \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ acts as identity on $CH_0(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$, we get

$$CH_0(X)_{\mathbf{Q}} = ((\tilde{\Pi}_{0,0} + \tilde{\Pi}_{1,0} + \dots + \tilde{\Pi}_{i,0}) + (c_{0,0} + c_{1,0} + \dots + c_{i,0}))_* CH_0(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}.$$

Applying N times the correspondence Δ_X to $CH_0(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$, we even get

$$CH_0(X)_{\mathbf{Q}} = ((\tilde{\Pi}_{0,0} + \dots + \tilde{\Pi}_{i,0}) + (c_{0,0} + \dots + c_{i,0}))_*^{\circ N} CH_0(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}.$$

Each of the correspondences $c_{k,0}$ is homologically trivial. It is a fact that for X Kimura finite dimensional, the ideal $\mathcal{I}$ of homologically trivial correspondences is nilpotent (and not just a nil-ideal, cf. [20, 17, 2]). Therefore, for N large enough (for example the nilpotent index of $\mathcal{I}$), we see by expanding out that each term in the expression $((\tilde{\Pi}_{0,0} + \dots + \tilde{\Pi}_{i,0}) + (c_{0,0} + \dots + c_{i,0}))_*^{\circ N}$ written down as a sum involves one of the $\tilde{\Pi}_{k,0}$, i.e. is of the form

$A \circ \tilde{\Pi}_{k,0} \circ B$ for some integer k and some correspondences A and B in $CH_d(X \times X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$. Now each $\tilde{\Pi}_{k,0}$ is supported on $X \times Z$ for some closed subscheme Z of X of dimension at most k . It is not too difficult to see that $A \circ \tilde{\Pi}_{k,0} \circ B$ is then supported on $X \times Z'$ for some closed subscheme Z' of X of dimension at most k . This concludes the proof. $\square$

Remark 5.3. If X is a surface, $B(X)$ holds unconditionally. Moreover if X has vanishing geometric genus $p_g := h_{2,0}$, clearly $H_2(X)$ is supported in codimension one and $H_2(X) = \tilde{N}^1 H_2(X)$. Therefore, we recover the following unconditional result due to Guletskii and Pedrini [12] : if X is a surface with $p_g = 0$ whose Chow motive is finite dimensional then the Bloch conjecture is true for X .

Remark 5.4. The generalized Bloch conjecture states that if the Hodge numbers $h_{i+1,0}, h_{i+2,0}, \dots, h_{d,0}$ of X vanish, then $CH_0(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ is supported in dimension i . Proposition 5.2 shows that if the generalized Hodge conjecture holds for X and if the Lefschetz conjecture holds for all varieties of dimension $\leq \dim X$ then $\mathfrak{h}(X)$ finite dimensional implies that the generalized Bloch conjecture holds for X .

In the cases $i = 0$ and $i = 1$, proposition 5.2 holds integrally and the Chow group of 0-cycles of X can be computed explicitly.

Proposition 5.5. *Assume $B(X)$ and $FD(X)$. If $H_i(X) = \tilde{N}^1 H_i(X)$ for all $i > 0$, then $CH_0(X) = \mathbf{Z}$.*

Proof. This is a refinement of a result of Voisin [43, theorem 3]. The projector π_0 can be chosen to be $X \times x$ for a 0-cycle x of X of degree 1. By proposition 4.9 and theorem 4.10, we have the equality

$$CH_0(X)_{\mathbf{Q}} = (\pi_0)_* CH_0(X)_{\mathbf{Q}} = \mathbf{Q}.$$

Moreover, $CH_0(X)$ has no torsion because the Albanese map $CH_0(X)_{\text{hom}} \rightarrow \text{Alb}_X$ is an isomorphism on the torsion by a famous result of Roitman [34], cf. also [5]. $\square$

Given a smooth projective complex variety X of dimension d , its i^{th} Deligne cohomology group $H_i^{\mathcal{D}}(X, \mathbf{Z}(p))$ is the $(2d-i)^{\text{th}}$ hypercohomology group of the complex $\mathbf{Z}_{\mathcal{D}}(d-p)$ given by $0 \rightarrow \mathbf{Z} \xrightarrow{(2i\pi)^{d-p}} \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow \Omega_X \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \Omega_X^{d-p-1} \rightarrow 0$. In other words,

$$H_i^{\mathcal{D}}(X, \mathbf{Z}(p)) = \mathbb{H}^{2d-i}(X, \mathbf{Z}_{\mathcal{D}}(d-p)).$$

Deligne cohomology comes with a cycle map (which is functorial)

$$cl_i^{\mathcal{D}} : CH_i(X) \rightarrow H_{2i}^{\mathcal{D}}(X, \mathbf{Z}(i))$$

and fits into an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow J_i(X) \rightarrow H_{2i}^{\mathcal{D}}(X, \mathbf{Z}(i)) \rightarrow \text{Hdg}_{2i}(X) \rightarrow 0$$

where $\text{Hdg}_{2i}(X)$ denotes the Hodge classes in $H_{2i}(X, \mathbf{Z})$ and $J_i(X)$ is Griffiths' i^{th} intermediate Jacobian.

Proposition 5.6. *Assume $B(X)$ and $FD(X)$. If $H_i(X) = \tilde{N}^1 H_i(X)$ whenever $i > 1$, then $CH_0(X) \simeq H_0^{\mathcal{D}}(X, \mathbf{Z})$. Moreover, $CH_0(X)_{\text{hom}}$ is representable.*

Proof. By proposition 4.9 and theorem 4.10,

$$CH_0(X)_{\mathbf{Q}} = (\pi_0 + \pi_1)_* CH_0(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}.$$

By the fact that $\pi_0 = X \times \{x\}$ and by Murre's description of π_1 , we get that the Abel-Jacobi map $CH_0(X)_{\text{hom}, \mathbf{Q}} = \text{Ker}((\pi_0)_* : CH_0(X)_{\mathbf{Q}} \rightarrow CH_0(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}) \rightarrow \text{Alb}_X$ is injective and induced by the correspondence π_1 . Therefore, $CH_0(X)_{\text{hom}, \mathbf{Q}}$ is representable and the rational Deligne class map $cl_0^{\mathcal{D}} : CH_0(X)_{\mathbf{Q}} \rightarrow H_0^{\mathcal{D}}(X, \mathbf{Q})$ is injective. By a result of Esnault and Levine [9], it is an isomorphism. The integral statement follows by Roitman's theorem stating that the Albanese map is an isomorphism on the torsion. $\square$

***m*-cycles.** Lewis and Schoen proved independently the following (see [24] and [36])

Theorem 5.7 (Lewis, Schoen). *Assume the GHC holds for all varieties. If $\text{Gr}_{N_H}^l H_{2l+k}(X, \mathbf{Q}) \neq 0$ for some $k \geq 2$ then $CH_l(X)_{\text{alg}}$ is not representable.*

The statement below, when considered in the case $i = 1$, gives a partial converse for varieties X finite dimensional in the sense of Kimura.

Proposition 5.8 (Generalization of proposition 5.2). *Assume $B(X)$ and $FD(X)$. If the CK projectors $\pi_0, \dots, \pi_{2m-1}$ act as zero on $CH_m(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ (for example if $g_{p,q}(X) = 0$ for $q > m$ and $p + q \leq 2m$) and if $g_{p,q}(X) = 0$ for*

(i) $p < m$ when $2m \leq p + q \leq 2m + i$

and for

(ii) $p \leq m$ when $p + q > 2m + i$

then $CH_m(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ is supported in dimension $m + i$.

Proof. Under the assumptions on the coniveau numbers, $CH_m(X)_{\mathbf{Q}} = (\tilde{\pi}_{2m,m} + \tilde{\pi}_{2m+1,m} + \dots + \tilde{\pi}_{2m+i,m})_* CH_m(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$. We now proceed as in the proof of proposition 5.2. $\square$

Remark 5.9. One could think that the extra condition $g_{p,q}(X) = 0$ for $q > m$ and $p + q \leq 2m$ might force, by symmetry of the Hodge diamond, the vanishing of some $g_{m,m+k}(X)$ for some $k \leq i$. It can be checked that this is not the case.

5.2 Injectivity and surjectivity of some cycle class maps

Proposition 5.10. *Assume $B(X)$ and $FD(X)$. If the coniveau numbers $g_{p,q}(X)$ vanish for*

(i) $p < l$ when $p + q \geq 2l$

and for

(ii) $p \geq l$ when $p + q < 2l$,

then $CH_l(X)_{\text{hom}, \mathbf{Q}} = 0$.

Proof. We have $CH_l(X)_{\text{hom}, \mathbf{Q}} = \text{Ker}(\tilde{\pi}_{2l, l})$ by proposition 4.18 and $\text{Ker}(\tilde{\pi}_{2l, l}) = \text{Im}(\text{id} - \tilde{\pi}_{2l, l}) = 0$ by theorem 4.10. $\square$

Corollary 5.11. *Assume $B(X)$ and $FD(X)$. If the coniveau numbers $g_{p,q}(X)$ vanish for $p \neq q$ and $q \leq k$, then $CH_l(X)_{\text{hom}, \mathbf{Q}} = 0$ for all $l \leq k$.*

Proposition 5.12 (Answers conditionally question 0.6 of [36]). *Assume $B(X)$ and $FD(X)$. Suppose there is an integer $p \geq 0$ such that the coniveau numbers $g_{i,j}(X)$ vanish if*

(i) $i + j \leq 2p$ and $j > p$

and if

(ii) $i + j = 2p + 1$ and $|i - j| > 1$

and if

(iii) $i + j \geq 2p + 2$ and $i \leq p$

then $CH_p(X)_{\text{hom}, \mathbf{Q}} = CH_p(X)_{\text{alg}, \mathbf{Q}}$ and the rational Deligne cycle class map

$$cl_p^{\mathcal{D}} : CH_p(X)_{\mathbf{Q}} \rightarrow H_{2p}^{\mathcal{D}}(X, \mathbf{Q}(p))$$

is injective. Moreover, $CH_p(X)_{\text{alg}}$ is rationally representable.

Proof. By the assumptions made on the coniveau numbers of X , it appears that the only refined CK projectors acting possibly non-trivially on $CH_p(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ are $\tilde{\pi}_{2p,p}$ and $\tilde{\pi}_{2p+1,p}$. Therefore,

$$CH_p(X)_{\mathbf{Q}} = (\tilde{\pi}_{2p,p} + \tilde{\pi}_{2p+1,p})_* CH_p(X)_{\mathbf{Q}}.$$

Together with propositions 4.18 and 4.20, this shows that algebraic equivalence and homological equivalence agree rationally on p -cycles on X and that

$$\tilde{\pi}_{2p+1,p} : CH_p(X)_{\text{hom}, \mathbf{Q}} = CH_p(X)_{\text{alg}, \mathbf{Q}} \rightarrow J_p(X) \otimes \mathbf{Q}$$

is injective. Consequently the rational Deligne cycle class map $cl_p^{\mathcal{D}} : CH_p(X)_{\mathbf{Q}} \rightarrow H_{2p}^{\mathcal{D}}(X, \mathbf{Q}(p))$ is injective thanks to the description of Deligne cohomology as an extension of the intermediate Jacobian with the Hodge classes. The fact that $CH_p(X)_{\text{alg}}$ is rationally representable is then standard. $\square$

Proposition 5.13 (Answers conditionally question 1 of [9]). *Assume the generalized Hodge conjecture holds in general and assume $FD(X)$. Suppose there is an integer $s \geq 0$ such that the Hodge numbers $h_{i,j}(X)$ vanish if*

(i) $i + j \leq 2s + 2$ and $|i - j| > 1$

and if

(ii) $i + j > 2s + 2$ and $j > s + 1$

Then the rational Deligne cycle class maps

$$cl_p^{\mathcal{D}} : CH_p(X)_{\mathbf{Q}} \rightarrow H_{2p}^{\mathcal{D}}(X, \mathbf{Q}(p))$$

are injective for $p = 0, \dots, s$.

	0	1	2	$s+1$	$d-s-1$	$d-1$	d
0	*	*					
1	*	*	*				
2		*	*	$\ddots$			
			$\ddots$	$\ddots$	*		
$s+1$				*	*	*	*
					*	*	*
					*	*	*
$d-s-1$				*	*	*	*
					*	$\ddots$	$\ddots$
						$\ddots$	*
$d-1$							*
d							*

Proof. The proof is exactly the same as for proposition 5.12 once one remarks that, under the generalized Hodge conjecture being true, for fixed $p \in \{0, \dots, s\}$ the coniveau numbers of X satisfy the conditions (i), (ii) and (iii) of proposition 5.12. $\square$

Remark 5.14. In the case $s = d$, we can actually get rid of the assumption of the generalized Hodge conjecture for all smooth projective varieties. Indeed, if the generalized Hodge conjecture holds for X , then we have $\tilde{N}^{[i/2]} H_i(X, \mathbf{Q}) = N_H^{[i/2]} H_i(X, \mathbf{Q})$ for all i . See also [39, Th. 4].

Acknowledgements. Thanks to François Charles and Burt Totaro for useful discussions and comments. I am grateful to Claire Voisin for her interest in this work and her comments which helped improve the writing and remove some inaccuracies.

References

- [1] Yves André. *Une introduction aux motifs (motifs purs, motifs mixtes, périodes)*, volume 17 of *Panoramas et Synthèses [Panoramas and Syntheses]*. Société Mathématique de France, Paris, 2004.
- [2] Yves André. Motifs de dimension finie (d’après S.-I. Kimura, P. O’Sullivan...). *Astérisque*, (299):Exp. No. 929, viii, 115–145, 2005. Séminaire Bourbaki. Vol. 2003/2004.
- [3] Yves André and Bruno Kahn. (with an appendix by P. O’Sullivan) Nilpotence, radicaux et structures monoïdales. *Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova*, 108:107–291, 2002.
- [4] Arnaud Beauville. Sur l’anneau de Chow d’une variété abélienne. *Math. Ann.*, 273(4):647–651, 1986.
- [5] S. Bloch. Torsion algebraic cycles and a theorem of Roitman. *Compositio Math.*, 39(1):107–127, 1979.

- [6] S. Bloch and V. Srinivas. Remarks on correspondences and algebraic cycles. *Amer. J. Math.*, 105(5):1235–1253, 1983.
- [7] Spencer Bloch. *Lectures on algebraic cycles*. Duke University Mathematics Series, IV. Duke University Mathematics Department, Durham, N.C., 1980.
- [8] Pierre Deligne. Théorie de Hodge. II. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, (40):5–57, 1971.
- [9] Hélène Esnault and Marc Levine. Surjectivity of cycle maps. *Astérisque*, (218):203–226, 1993. Journées de Géométrie Algébrique d’Orsay (Orsay, 1992).
- [10] Thomas Geisser. Tate’s conjecture, algebraic cycles and rational K -theory in characteristic p . *K-Theory*, 13(2):109–122, 1998.
- [11] A. Grothendieck. Hodge’s general conjecture is false for trivial reasons. *Topology*, 8:299–303, 1969.
- [12] V. Guletskiĭ and C. Pedrini. Finite-dimensional motives and the conjectures of Beilinson and Murre. *K-Theory*, 30(3):243–263, 2003. Special issue in honor of Hyman Bass on his seventieth birthday. Part III.
- [13] Uwe Jannsen. *Mixed motives and algebraic K-theory*, volume 1400 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1990. With appendices by S. Bloch and C. Schoen.
- [14] Uwe Jannsen. Motives, numerical equivalence, and semi-simplicity. *Invent. Math.*, 107(3):447–452, 1992.
- [15] Uwe Jannsen. Motivic sheaves and filtrations on Chow groups. In *Motives (Seattle, WA, 1991)*, volume 55 of *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, pages 245–302. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1994.
- [16] Uwe Jannsen. Equivalence relations on algebraic cycles. In *The arithmetic and geometry of algebraic cycles (Banff, AB, 1998)*, volume 548 of *NATO Sci. Ser. C Math. Phys. Sci.*, pages 225–260. Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 2000.
- [17] Uwe Jannsen. On finite-dimensional motives and Murre’s conjecture. In *Algebraic cycles and motives. Vol. 2*, volume 344 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, pages 112–142. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2007.
- [18] Bruno Kahn. Équivalences rationnelle et numérique sur certaines variétés de type abélien sur un corps fini. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)*, 36(6):977–1002 (2004), 2003.
- [19] Bruno Kahn, Jacob P. Murre, and Claudio Pedrini. On the transcendental part of the motive of a surface. In *Algebraic cycles and motives. Vol. 2*, volume 344 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, pages 143–202. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2007.
- [20] Shun-Ichi Kimura. Chow groups are finite dimensional, in some sense. *Math. Ann.*, 331(1):173–201, 2005.
- [21] S. L. Kleiman. Algebraic cycles and the Weil conjectures. In *Dix exposés sur la cohomologie des schémas*, pages 359–386. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1968.
- [22] Steven L. Kleiman. The standard conjectures. In *Motives (Seattle, WA, 1991)*, volume 55 of *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, pages 3–20. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1994.
- [23] Robert Laterveer. Algebraic varieties with small Chow groups. *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.*, 38(4):673–694, 1998.
- [24] James D. Lewis. Towards a generalization of Mumford’s theorem. *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.*, 29(2):267–272, 1989.
- [25] David I. Lieberman. Higher Picard varieties. *Amer. J. Math.*, 90:1165–1199, 1968.
- [26] David I. Lieberman. Numerical and homological equivalence of algebraic cycles on Hodge manifolds. *Amer. J. Math.*, 90:366–374, 1968.

- [27] A. S. Merkurjev and A. A. Suslin. K -cohomology of Severi-Brauer varieties and the norm residue homomorphism. *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.*, 46(5):1011–1046, 1135–1136, 1982.
- [28] D. Mumford. Rational equivalence of 0-cycles on surfaces. *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.*, 9:195–204, 1968.
- [29] J. P. Murre. On the motive of an algebraic surface. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 409:190–204, 1990.
- [30] J. P. Murre. On a conjectural filtration on the Chow groups of an algebraic variety. I. The general conjectures and some examples. *Indag. Math. (N.S.)*, 4(2):177–188, 1993.
- [31] Madhav V. Nori. Algebraic cycles and Hodge-theoretic connectivity. *Invent. Math.*, 111(2):349–373, 1993.
- [32] Kapil H. Paranjape. Cohomological and cycle-theoretic connectivity. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 139(3):641–660, 1994.
- [33] A. A. Roĭtman. Rational equivalence of zero-dimensional cycles. *Mat. Sb. (N.S.)*, 89(131):569–585, 671, 1972.
- [34] A. A. Roĭtman. The torsion of the group of 0-cycles modulo rational equivalence. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 111(3):553–569, 1980.
- [35] M. Saito. Bloch’s Conjecture and Chow Motives. Preprint, <http://arxiv.org/abs/math/0002009>.
- [36] Chad Schoen. On Hodge structures and nonrepresentability of Chow groups. *Compositio Math.*, 88(3):285–316, 1993.
- [37] A. J. Scholl. Classical motives. In *Motives (Seattle, WA, 1991)*, volume 55 of *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, pages 163–187. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1994.
- [38] Oleg N. Smirnov. Graded associative algebras and Grothendieck standard conjectures. *Invent. Math.*, 128(1):201–206, 1997.
- [39] Charles Vial. Projectors on the intermediate algebraic Jacobians. Preprint.
- [40] V. Voevodsky. A nilpotence theorem for cycles algebraically equivalent to zero. *Internat. Math. Res. Notices*, (4):187–198 (electronic), 1995.
- [41] Claire Voisin. Remarks on zero-cycles of self-products of varieties. In *Moduli of vector bundles (Sanda, 1994; Kyoto, 1994)*, volume 179 of *Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math.*, pages 265–285. Dekker, New York, 1996.
- [42] Claire Voisin. *Théorie de Hodge et géométrie algébrique complexe*, volume 10 of *Cours Spécialisés [Specialized Courses]*. Société Mathématique de France, Paris, 2002.
- [43] Claire Voisin. Remarks on filtrations on Chow groups and the Bloch conjecture. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4)*, 183(3):421–438, 2004.

DPMMS, UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE, WILBERFORCE ROAD, CAMBRIDGE, CB3 0WB, UNITED KINGDOM

e-mail : C.Vial@dpmms.cam.ac.uk